The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1898.

The Week.

Spain's final surrender is made, as her first choice of a hopeless war was made, after despairing petitions to the Powers for help. She has appealed to every European chancellery, and has got for answer only a reminder that this is a very hard and practical world; that friendly sentiments are lovely, but that shell and bayonets and hard cash are the things that count; and that the best thing she can do, being vanquished, is to agree with her conqueror quickly, lest his terms be made more severe. The Spanish Commissioners were, of course, bound to make the best fight they could. They have argued valiantly with men who all the while had them by the throat, and at last have had to admit that arguments are of no avail against brute force. This end they must have foreseen from the beginning. In fact, there is good evidence that Spain sent her Commissioners to Paris well knowing that they would have to consent to stripping their country of all her colonial possessions. Doubtless they hoped for a larger money consideration for the Philippines, but to the loss of the islands the majority of intelligent Spaniards had made up their minds in advance. Indeed, the shrewdest opinion in Spain has been, ever since the protocol was signed, against the policy of keeping the Philippines, even if allowed to. Chambers of Commerce have distinctly warned Sagasta that the country would not endure the sacrifices necessary in order to restore Spanish sovereignty in the archipelago. It may turn out, as some patriotic Spaniards have already predicted, that Spain's getting rid of all her colonies will be a blessing in disguise—may lead to better conditions and better government in the Peninsula itself. But, for the moment, it is certainly a cup of humiliation which is pressed to the lips of Spain. She is witnessing and consenting to the final crash to ruin of the greatest empire, in mere extent of territory, that the world ever saw.

Our Office of Naval Intelligence has just published a pamphlet entitled "Views of Admiral Cervera regarding the Spanish Navy in the Late War," which contains some astonishing revelations. It is made up of letters written by Cervera, from a date long anterior to the outbreak of hostilities down to May 5. They show that that gallant officer knew, and repeatedly informed his Government, that the sailing west from Cape Verde meant the certain destruction of the Spanish fleet. As early as 1895, Admiral Cervera had written a demonstration of the inability of the Spanish navy to cope with that of the United States. In January last he renewed his warnings on that head, pointing out the gross defects in the equipment of his ships. Shortly before the *Maine* was blown up, he wrote to the Minister of Marine complaining that "no charts of the American seas" were to be had by the naval commanders. As the conflict drew sensibly near, he detailed to the Government the frightful unpreparedness of his squadron. The *Colon* was without her big guns; the *Vizcaya's* boilers were foul, and she could make only half speed; the heavy guns on the *Teresa* and *Oquendo* were practically useless through defective mechanism and bad cartridges. On the very day before the fleet was finally ordered to sail, the captains held a council of war and decided that it would be madness to sail to the West Indies, and advised the Government to recall the ships to the Canaries, abandoning Cuba and Porto Rico to their fate. When, in spite of all, sailing orders came, Cervera obeyed, like the brave patriot he was, yet felt it his duty to tell his Government that "nothing can be expected of this expedition except the total destruction of the fleet, or its hasty and demoralizing return." In this opinion he was joined by Admiral Vilamil, who said he was ready to die (he did at Santiago), as a seaman should be, but that he must tell Sagasta the loss of the squadron was certain. Another of the remarkable features of the sailing of this last of the Spanish Armadas is that it put to sea absolutely without a plan. "There is no plan or concert," wrote Cervera on the eve of sailing. It was only by a kind of good luck that he even got into Santiago. It is needless to dwell upon the last act of the tragedy. Cervera made his despairing dash on July 3 only on positive orders from Blanco.

The report of the Secretary of the Navy is interesting chiefly as showing the views entertained by the Administration in reference to our future naval policy. The recommendations include three new battle-ships, of 13,500 tons each, three armored cruisers of 12,000 tons each, three protected cruisers of 6,000 tons each, and six sheathed and coppered cruisers of 2,500 tons each. The total estimated cost of this new outfit, exclusive of armor and armament, is $37,000,000. The cost of the armor and armament will bring the total up to $50,000,000. This is upon the assumption that the Philippines are to be "annexed to the United States." Without this acquisition, the Secretary says that the three armored cruisers at $4,000,000 each, exclusive of armor and armament, would be sufficient. This is only the beginning of the expenditure for Philippinedom. It does not include coast fortification or military service. It is the "entering wedge." For a nation that has had within four years a Treasury deficit of nearly $200,000,000 on ordinary expenditures, this is rather a startling programme for its future peace establishment.

Gen. Shafter's speech at the banquet of the Sons of the Revolution on Friday night was the fullest defence of the Santiago campaign he has yet made. But, from the standpoint of military science, his defence is practically an admission the his critics are right. He confessed that the whole expedition was an improvised affair, crowded upon inadequate transports with defective equipment; but he did not "complain" of this, for what good would it do? He could not take his cavalry horses, he could not take his ambulances, or land his heavy artillery, but what of that? Hugger-mugger and helter-skelter though everything was, the men were brave and uncomplaining and "got there." Gen. Shafter admits that there was very little "strategy" in his campaign. He just flung himself ashore as best he could and floundered along towards Santiago. Of course, he has the brute fact of final success to point to, but what all the foreign attachés will report is the undoubted truth that only Spanish sloth and inertia prevented an appalling disaster to Shafter's army. He will still maintain that this was a condition he fully counted upon, and that he did things in the teeth of all rules, knowing that the Spanish generals would not be alert enough to give him the punishment he deserved. But what is this except to say, regarding Santiago, what the Duke of Wellington said of a general sent to take Rangoon, "He is a fool, and a d——d fool, but he can take Rangoon"?

The crying need of reorganizing the whole army system is one thing the President's investigating committee have found out, if they have discovered nothing else. Whenever a straightforward and experienced man like Col. Roosevelt takes the stand, we get a terrible picture of a system so stupid that even the gods would strive in vain to administer it. Put incompetent men in charge, and chaos seems come again. The Circumlocution Office was nothing to our army system. Dr. Conner fairly groaned last week when once more the responsible officer evaded detection. Just as the Doctor was, as he thought, getting at the responsibility for inadequate wagon transportation at Montauk, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

witness blandly told him that all that was quite another man's affair. So it has been all through. Every suspected officer swears he did his whole duty, yet the result was confusion, and waste, and disease, and suffering, and death. The results were awful, yet nobody was responsible. Then Congress should not lose an hour in devising a system which would make somebody responsible.

It is not five months since the First New York Regiment, composed of some of our best National Guard companies and commanded by a graduate of West Point, was sent to Hawaii's capital, famed for its pleasant climate and attractive life, and equipped with several hospitals and plentiful sanitary supplies. The regiment had no fighting to do, no trenches to lie in, no hardships of any kind to endure, and yet it is doubtful if any of the regiments which went to Cuba have suffered much more than it has done from disease of all kinds. According to recent dispatches, it had no less than 162 patients on November 14, of whom 63 were typhoid cases alone, and three more deaths were reported as additions to an already shockingly large list. So bad has this state of affairs become that the War Department has confessed its inability to keep the New Yorkers there any longer, and has ordered their immediate return to San Francisco. It even assures the public that now, after all this suffering and death, the camps have been moved to high ground, and "every possible sanitary precaution taken." But still more frightful is the fact, similarly reported from Honolulu, that the "transport *Arizona* sailed for Manila, November 10, leaving about 160 men in the hospital" because of an outbreak of disease while the ship was en route from San Francisco. Yet we hear of no charges of incapacity or incompetence, no reports of inspectors-general, and no court-martials.

Our Thanksgiving Day appears to have been celebrated in a warlike manner abroad. In London the Anglo-American *entente* was made the subject of felicitation at a dinner at the Hotel Cecil, where the Lord Chancellor made a speech in which he said that England and America united could, if need be, defy the world in arms—a sentiment which was rapturously applauded. In Berlin our givers of thanks dined at the Kaiserhof, where the principal speech was made by Gen. Wheaton, U. S. A. (retired). The General hoped that Congress would now realize the necessity of an army commensurate with the needs of the greater nation—that is, a nation which includes twelve or fifteen hundred tropical islands off the coast of Asia. This sort of thanksgiving, we hardly need say, is not to our taste. We should have preferred, both in London and in Berlin and still more in every American city, the giving of thanks to the Ruler of the Universe that he has put it in the heart of the most powerful monarch in the world, the man who rules more territory and can put more soldiers in motion than any other man or nation, to call on his fellow-men to cease making preparations for mutual slaughter. It is to us a bewildering coincidence that the freest nation in the world, or rather the two freest nations, should be celebrating a quasi-alliance for what it may be worth in shot and shell, while the autocrat of all the Russias is offering to both of them and to all mankind the benison of peace.

Mr. Chamberlain's article in *Scribner's* wisely enough points out for our benefit the great lessons of English colonial administration. Everybody knows that we must copy these or make a mess of it. But what strikes one most is Mr. Chamberlain's scarcely veiled eagerness that the United States take the plunge. Of course, he repeats all the platitudes about his being a foreigner, and its being presumptuous in him to offer advice, etc.; but, as a disinterested well-wisher, he is bound to say that he sees a great career of glory and usefulness before us if only we rise to the height of our present opportunity. Now, saying nothing about the wisdom of the course Mr. Chamberlain recommends, we cannot overlook the fact that this counsel of his comes from a man who, if he saw profit for himself or his country in misleading us, would not hesitate to do so. This may be inferred from avowals of his own. In the recent Life of Parnell we have a judgment on the Irish leader from Mr. Chamberlain's pen which is even more significant as regards his own character than in respect to Parnell's. He said: "It is idle to talk of Parnell treating me badly or of my treating Parnell badly. *We acted as politicians.*" Then Mr. Chamberlain added: "Mr. Parnell was a great man. Unscrupulous, if I may say so. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I mean that he was *unscrupulous like every great man.*" Americans may well fear unscrupulous great men even when they come bearing Philippines. Time was when our protectionists would have needed no other argument against expansion than English approval of it.

Were the colonial questions now before this country to be decided by a careful study of the proposed island populations, of their social and physical status, and of the adaptability of our own institutions for the intended changes, the article by Mr. W. Alleyne Ireland in the December *Atlantic* would certainly attract widespread attention. Having been seven years a resident in the English West Indian colonies and a careful student of the labor conditions to be found there, Mr. Ireland is able to adduce unanswerable facts to prove that only those colonies have succeeded in which cheap and indentured coolie labor has been imported to work the fields upon which the natives turn their backs as long as they have waste land upon which to squat and to raise the few necessaries of life. In British Guiana, the most successful colony of all, whose exports have an annual value of $9,000,000, the coolies form no less than one-half the population and perform three-quarters of the work. These indentured East Indians are kept in a state of semi-slavery, since they must work whether or no, five days a week and seven hours a day for five years, at the expiration of which they become absolutely free and can return home. So, too, in the Dutch colonial possessions, Java, which has a system of forced labor akin to slavery, has prospered amazingly in the same period during which Surinam, with free native labor, has barely avoided bankruptcy. Of all the West Indies only one, Barbados, is successful without coolie labor, because here the laborer is under absolute compulsion to work or starve. As a final proof of the correctness of his view of the necessity of indentured labor, Mr. Ireland points to our own Hawaiian Islands, where the question of the disposition of the contract Japanese, Chinese, and Portuguese workers awaits settlement and confronts McKinley with the possibility of still another "parochial" race trouble. In conclusion Mr. Ireland takes the strong ground that "any attempt to govern the tropical possessions of the United States on democratic principles is doomed to certain failure." What then? Is the country which is founded on the belief that all men are created equal, and which sacrificed 600,000 lives and vast treasure in a four years' war to uphold that doctrine, to keep its newly acquired outlying populations in a state of semi-slavery, and to import into them those same cheap contract laborers now refused admission to its States by law?

The increase of gold continues at such a pace that the Mint Bureau can hardly keep pace with it. The Director, Mr. Roberts, says that the returns from South Africa for the ten months of the present year show that its yield will exceed that of 1897 by $10,335,000. The yield from the Yukon country promises an increase over last year of $8,000,000, and these figures lead to the belief that the world's gold production for 1898 will reach the enormous sum of $283,192,800, that of 1897 having been in round figures $240,000,000. The whole product of gold and silver together in 1888 was only $251,000,000, reckoning the silver at its coining value of $1.29 per ounce. In other words, this year's production of gold exceeds the production of both metals ten years ago by more than $30,000,000. The gold famine that many po-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

liticians, and some men of scientific pretensions, predicted with such positiveness two or three years ago is as disappointing and elusive as the day of advent in the creed of Millerism.

It will probably be news to most people that the United States Government is actually digging a canal to connect the waters of the upper Mississippi River with those of the upper Illinois River. This fact is proclaimed with the outward semblance of truth in the last number of the *Engineering News*, which paper also gives the reasons, or the alleged reasons, why the work was undertaken. The principal one was that railroad freights were too high. The Chicago and Rock Island Road, which this canal (they call it the Hennepin Canal) will parallel for a considerable distance, was getting about a cent and a quarter average for hauling a ton of freight one mile. To bring down this extortionate charge the people of the United States from Maine to California must needs be taxed about $10,000,000, one-fifth of which has already been spent. But since the report on the strength of which this work was begun was made to Congress, the freight rates of this railroad have fallen to less than one cent per ton per mile. That this reduction was not due to terror engendered by the Hennepin Canal is evident from the fact that other railroads not exposed to this threatened competition have lowered their rates correspondingly, and some of them even more. The inference of the *Engineering News* is that by the time this canal is finished, there will not be a pound of freight that it can carry at a profit. That this is the probable outcome is shown by the present canal along the Illinois River from La Salle eastward, of which the Hennepin ditch is to be the continuation, which is used only by ducks and geese, the few boats there being either capsized in it or as idle as painted ships upon a painted ocean.

The projectors of the scheme of connecting the great lakes and the Atlantic Ocean at this port, by a canal from the St. Lawrence to the upper end of Lake Champlain and another from the lower end of Lake George to the Hudson River, say that a cut of twenty-nine miles in Canadian soil, and another of twenty-four miles in this State, are all that would be necessary; and their estimate is that the cut from the St. Lawrence to Lake Champlain would not cost more than from $3,000,000 to $4,000,000. The scheme has been favorably reported on by a deep-waterway commission authorized by Congress and appointed by the President, and its advocates are proceeding on the idea of having the two Governments perform the work, each doing the construction on its own side, thus making it a Government rather than a private enterprise. An effort will be made by those interested in the plan to have the Anglo-American Joint High Commission, which is now in session at Washington, take it up. It is well enough that it should be considered and discussed, but the burden of proof rests upon those who advocate the project. They must furnish convincing proof that, if their scheme be carried out now, it will not prove as great a failure as would have been the case with the Pittsburgh-Cleveland ship-canal project if that had been put through. A few years ago that looked like a most profitable investment, but now Mr. Carnegie, who broached it, says: "I do not wish to appear even by silence to be considered a party to any attempt to entice private capital to invest in building a canal between Pittsburgh and the lakes, because I am convinced that this capital would be entirely lost; if the canal were completed, the existing railroads could and would perform its service cheaper and more satisfactorily, because they can run all the year round."

The extraordinary spectacle has long been presented in the District of Columbia of a nation which at the start established the principle of home rule in local affairs, denying all share in the government of their city to the people who inhabit its capital. A fresh movement has been started at Washington for the restoration to the people of the right to vote; but it is safe to predict that Congress will lend it no favor. The experiment of letting the voters of the capital "run things" was thoroughly tried, and it proved such a dreadful failure that it had to be abandoned. The whole nation was disgraced by the scandals which forced themselves upon the attention of every visitor. The chief difficulty is the fact that a third of the men who would vote if the right of suffrage were allowed are negroes, most of whom are ignorant and corruptible. Unscrupulous white politicians would organize this force if they had the chance, and there would always be the danger of its proving a majority. Congress will therefore undoubtedly continue to make confession that the capital is incapable of self-rule, and maintain the present system of a commission of three members, appointed by the President, which has worked excellently under Executives of both parties.

Col. Roosevelt put party "harmony" on the only solid and enduring basis in the following deliverance at the Republican banquet in this city on Tuesday week:

"Whether I make a success of my administration depends on you men and on me and those whom you represent. Either of us can spoil it if we choose to be foolish. We have got to recognize differences of opinion and bury our prejudices. I appreciate the honor of my election. You are bound to me; you are bound to help me get a decent government; you are bound to subordinate your own feelings for the common cause. You recognize that Democratic and Republican rascals have got to be punished. Help me to do it."

That is a very different thing from the usual "harmony" talk, which invariably means that the Better Element of the party shall stop "kicking" at the disreputable doings of the Practical Element, and stop making a row about the appointment of shady characters to office. "Harmony" in support of decent government, in which the advocates of bad government bury their prejudices in the interest of the common cause, is something unknown hitherto in the political annals of this State, and its advent will be a cause for public rejoicing. If Gov. Roosevelt can carry that policy to success, the State will be justified in holding a jubilee.

Holland is noted for radical theology, but in the matter of international copyright she is still conservative to the point of being cobwebbed and moss-grown. The Netherlands Bookselling Union recently voted, two to one, to oppose granting copyright of any kind to foreigners, and pointed in justification to the utterances of leading Dutch statesmen and jurists. There is Mynheer Dr. J. D. Veergens, for example, who considers the "doctrine of so-called intellectual property" to be absolutely "untenable and exploded." He agrees with Mynheer Dr. J. A. Levy in maintaining that "an idea as soon as it is expressed is public property." Thought, their argument is, exists only in order to be "disseminated." Dissemination is the only way of making thought "fruitful." Hence authors ought to be glad to have their thoughts seized upon and disseminated by as many publishers as possible, and if any money is to be paid to anybody, the publishers will see to that. We believe, however, that a pretty long experience has shown that authors simply refuse to express ideas if they become public property in the act, and lock up all thoughts in impenetrable bosoms when publishers are at liberty to disseminate them for nothing. In fact, the main reason and confessed aim of copyright laws is to "encourage" authors to express ideas; and this method has, on the whole, worked better than the incontinent stealing of the ideas as soon as expressed. Our Dutchmen are on stronger ground, however, when they argue that "translation is not piracy." The reason it is not is, that it is "original work"; the translator "works in his own sphere of thought," and into it "the original author does not enter; the translator is absolute master." On translation of that sort (and a great deal of it is current) it can justly be said that the original author has no claim; the only payment he could demand would be of the nature of damages.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEMOCRATIC FATALISM.

We commented the other day on the paralyzing effect produced on the public by the announcement that a measure is "sure to pass." This was first introduced by Platt, as a sort of warning that the boss system was firmly established, and that the efforts made by reformers to oppose his measures, during Mayor Strong's administration, were idle. One can hardly say the same thing *ipsissimis verbis* of the Philippine scheme, but another phrase of like meaning is now in much vogue, namely, "We're in for it." This has, and is meant to have, precisely the same effect on the opposition to the Philippine scheme that "It's sure to pass" was meant to have and had on the opposition to Platt's measures. One meets with it every day in the mouth of some good man, as a reason why he should not spend either time or money in making head against "imperialism." If we chose to take a very despondent view of the situation, however, we should cite it as one of the numerous, but each in itself insignificant, signs that the old American republic is in a bad way. It is assailed by the very same class of men at whose hands all republics have perished—men who admire force and who abhor discussion. They cannot openly say, "You must not talk about our enterprises; we will not permit it." This would arouse furious opposition, and make clear to the country the danger which threatened it. They attain their end by indirect, but more effective means; they make it appear that no opposition will be of any use, that the thing in question "is sure to pass" or that we are already "in for it"—in other words, that we have already gone so far that retreat is impossible.

There could not be a better way of dealing with a democracy in the condition of ours—that is, a commercial democracy, busy in making money, rather sick of "politics," and very ready to leave to any one who is willing to take the trouble the management of their affairs. To persons in that state of mind it is a positive relief to hear that something or other, which they feel they ought to resist, is "sure to pass," or that they are already "in for it." It means deliverance from labor and trouble, possible loss of business, and an infinity of talk. This is really the way republics go down and have always gone down. Anti-democratic politicians like war for precisely the same reason. War always stops discussion instantly. The old barbaric traditions of every race make fighting, or the promotion of fighting, appear the highest service a man can render to his country, so that every politician knows that if, by hook or by crook, he can bring on a war, no matter how—if, for no reason or for any reason, he can procure the use of the national force against some foreigner—he will silence his adversaries far more effectually than he can hope to do by argument. Forty thousand stump-speakers of the highest order could not do so much to silence opposition, to dispose of Christ and the prophets and philosophers, as by the firing of one shot in anger or the capture of a tramp steamer. We have seen this ourselves very recently. All the arguments that you may think fatal to a war—its causelessness, its injustice, its needlessness—can be disposed of in five minutes by the men interested in bringing it on, by simply beginning it. More than this. It was pointed out by Dr. Huntington in his Thanksgiving sermon, that, the war once begun, even those who approved of it in the beginning to the point of considering it "a holy war," lose complete control of its direction; that a war begun obtensibly as a war of humanity may be turned before their eyes into an unusually brazen war of conquest, and "negotiations" so called, for distinctly predatory purposes, may be conducted for months before the eyes of the community, which will have no power to help itself even when the conquest threatens its own institutions. The reason of this is simple enough. When you let the war begin, the power passes to the commander of the army. Not only "the laws" are silent, but for practical purposes nearly every other mode of expression ceases. The "public opinion" described by Mr. Bryce as ruling America is, after a war, whatever the commander of the army—that is, the President—chooses to consider it to be.

For all these reasons and a good many others, we cannot help treating all utterances which help to leave the "good old cause," the cause of free popular government, without witnesses in this stage of its history, as treason of the worst kind. We have not, no thinking man has, the smallest doubt how this "imperialist" movement will end. The history of America under it will, in all human probability, be that of a calamity greater by far than the fall of the Roman Empire, considering what our example has been, what our religion is, what our knowledge and experience are, considering how many instruments of civilization we possess which the Romans did not. Therefore, we say that no one who professes to have convictions about this matter, should ever for one moment seem to doubt their value or their final triumph. Nothing is for us "sure to pass" until it has passed; we are not "in for it" until the Senate has confirmed the treaty. The American people will long survive the Republican party; and as long as it lives and enjoys free speech, it will be able to correct mistakes and right wrongs. The cause of civilization and liberty is eternal, and its claims on our best services are also eternal. They will never die out. Those of us who think this Philippine scheme is born in iniquity and must bear iniquitous fruit, are bound to keep saying so, no matter what the Senate or the President may do, or how much money it may make for the warriors. Nay, if it destroys this government, it will be none the less our duty to labor for its restoration, and it is our firm conviction that those who may now succeed in saving it, or who may have hereafter to work for its revival, will hold as high a place in American history as those who became immortal by founding it.

THE PHILIPPINE TYPE OF BOSS.

Our native bosses will be pleased to learn that the Filipinos have had experience with boss rule, and are likely to recognize it when American civilization carries our best forms of it among them. Samples of the Philippine variety are given in Prof. Worcester's interesting book, which we review on another page, and no one can read his descriptions of it without being struck by the similarity to our foremost American specimens. Perhaps the most striking sample given by Prof. Worcester is one Pedro Cuevas, who was the Dato, or Chief, of one of the Moro tribes in the island of Basilan. Pedro spent a considerable portion of his early manhood as a convict in a penal settlement. He conspired with two other convicts in a plan of escape which he worked out successfully. They behaved so well that they were granted unusual liberties, and, while working in the fields, suddenly attacked their guard, killed the officer in command, and escaped with a carbine in their possession. They next attacked the shop of a Chinaman, killed him, plundered his shop, and fled in a stolen boat to Basilan.

Pedro set up as a boss as soon as he landed at Basilan. He went to the nearest Moro village, asked for the Dato, and boldly entered his house. The Dato hurled a lance at him as he entered, narrowly missing him. Pedro then challenged the Dato to come out and fight, and the challenge was accepted, but as the Dato fought with a lance and wooden shield, and Pedro with a carbine, Pedro came off victorious, killing the Dato with a bullet sent through the shield. He and his three companions began war upon the tribe with such effect that they soon concluded they would rather fight with him than against him, and he led them against neighboring tribes with such prodigies of valor that they became convinced he bore a charmed life and they made him Dato.

He then set up absolute boss government. Death was the penalty for the slightest opposition to his will. "At first he did his own killing, but when his reputation was once firmly established, he turned work of that sort over to his subordinates." If he chose to drive off a herd of cattle, and the owner

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

objected, Boss Pedro said: "Cut off his head," and it was cut off. If he wished to add a young girl to his already large collection of wives, and the father objected, the order was again, "Cut off his head." He was too shrewd to fight the Spanish authorities, and always took sides with the Spanish Governor, sending him the head of any one of his subjects that he might express a wish for at any time. On one occasion when he was standing with a visitor in front of his house, a Moro from a neighboring village rode up on a fine horse. The visitor expressed admiration for the horse, and when Boss Pedro asked him if he would like to have it, replied thoughtlessly that he should. Whereupon, greatly to his surprise, the Boss "picked up a rifle, took deliberate aim, shot the Moro dead, and presented his guest with the mount." Which one of our bosses has the "nerve" to rule in this supreme style?

Boss Pedro is a native, but there was a few years ago at least one Spanish Governor in the islands who was his equal in firmness if not in barbarity. This was Gen. Arolas of the town of Sulu, the same man who is now administering the only kind of firm Spanish government there is in Havana. It is said that he was sent as Governor because of a desire of the Spanish Government to get him into some place from which he would be extremely unlikely to return. As soon as he arrived in Sulu, however, he made prisoners of most of its native Moro inhabitants, set them to work in improving the sanitation of the town, changing it from a fever centre to an unusually healthful place. Gradually he constructed water-works, a market, established a free-school system, and converted the natives into disciplined soldiers, with whom he marched against neighboring Moro villages, subjugated them, and extended his rule over them. He, like Boss Pedro, convinced the natives that he bore a charmed life, and they called him "Papa" and obeyed him absolutely. He punished disobedience with death. When Prof. Worcester's party of visiting naturalists asked him for permission to hunt in the woods adjoining the town, he granted it, saying that if they followed his directions, they would come through all right. His directions were: "If you meet armed Moros outside of the town, order them to lay down their weapons and retire. If they do not instantly obey, shoot them." It was one of the rules of the town that no horse should be tied in the street. One day the Boss was walking through the town when he saw a saddle-horse hitched to a tree. He had the owner summoned before him, explained the rule to him, and asked him not to violate it again. A few days later he found the same horse tied again in the same place. Calling a sergeant, he ordered him to take four men, lead the horse to the end of the wharf, and throw him over. The order was instantly obeyed. The owner found his horse at the end of the wharf dead, after a long search.

It is very clear that our bosses can give few points to these experts in the business, no matter how much similarity there may be, either in the preparatory training of their early years or in their subsequent practical experience in power. We give these citations with some reluctance, lest the attractiveness of the Philippine field encourage unduly the desire of our native boss talent to get there as soon as possible. It would, doubtless, be a gain for us here at home if they were to go in large numbers, but their doings in the islands might bring American civilization into disrepute. One of the saddest conclusions of Prof. Worcester's book is the following: "On the whole, after making somewhat extensive observations among the Philippine natives, I am inclined to formulate the law that their morals improve as the square of the distance from churches and other so-called 'civilizing influences.'"

STATE POLICE CONTROL.

It is evident that great pressure is being brought upon Col. Roosevelt to induce him to favor, as Governor, legislation taking the control of the police of this city out of the hands of the Mayor and placing it in the hands of the Governor. There are said to be two schemes with this end in view. One is the creation of a metropolitan police commission for this city alone, to be appointed by the Governor, something like what we had between 1857 and 1870; and the other is the establishment of a state constabulary system bringing the police forces of all the cities in the State under State control. The principle involved in both schemes is the same, and is nothing less than the complete destruction of the right of self-government in cities. Nothing could be more grotesque in the way of consistency than for a Republican Legislature to enact either one of the schemes this winter, only a year after our famous new charter, constructed and enacted by Republicans, was put in operation. The great merit of that charter, all its advocates assured us, lay in its bestowal upon us of a "larger measure of home rule" than we had been permitted hitherto to enjoy.

There can be only one excuse or justification for such legislation as is proposed, and that is that this city, and every other city of the State in case all are included, have shown an utter incapacity for self-government. The police power lies at the very foundation of government, and if that is taken away, why leave any other power for a city to exercise? Why not govern us entirely by State commissions? If we have shown ourselves unfit for self-government, why not take all government away from us, as well as a part of it? Are the Republicans of the State as a party prepared to take the position that the cities of the State have shown themselves unfit for self-government? Are the eminent Republicans who constructed the charter prepared to confess after a year of trial that they were all wrong in their views of its wisdom? Is Col. Roosevelt prepared to take back all he has said in favor of responsible government in this city, with especial reference to police legislation?

As is generally known, Col. Roosevelt has been a strong advocate of a single-headed police system. He advocated that method of police administration when he was a Police Commissioner, as did two of his associates, Messrs. Andrews and Grant, and he urged the new charter-makers to adopt it. Did he then urge that the power to appoint this single head should be taken from the Mayor and lodged in the Governor? On the contrary, when in March of last year Lauterbach was preparing a bill for State control of the police, Col. Roosevelt said to a reporter for the *Evening Post:*

> "The police force should, of course, be kept in the control of the city. All the legislation needed is to allow the Mayor to exercise throughout his term the power of removal he now has for six months."

The fundamental principle of a single-headed control is direct responsibility to the appointing power. Can we get that by having a single head selected by a man who is not directly responsible to the people of the city? Did Col. Roosevelt receive a majority of the votes of the people of this city at the last election? Is he their choice as the official who is to control their police force? Of course, if he favors State police control, he will insist upon a single head. How then will Gen. Tracy and the other Republican charter-makers reconcile that method of control with the following views which they put forth in February, 1897, in defence of the bi-partisan police provision of the charter?

> "The final and conclusive objection to a single commissioner is that the power over the property and liberty of the citizen, wielded by the head of such a body as the police force of the consolidated city, is too tremendous to be intrusted to any one man. The abuse of such power, when in the hands of a single individual, could only be known when the power had been exercised and the mischief had been done, and, even then, its operation would be so secret and so insidious that detection would be difficult and prevention out of the question."

If the power is too great to trust to one man, who is selected by the Mayor, whom the people of the city themselves elect, does it become any less dangerous when trusted to the hands of one man selected by a Governor who is not responsible directly to the people of the city? Then, too, suppose this power of appointment of heads of police for all the cities of the State be given to Gov. Roosevelt in 1899. Suppose, also, that he exercises it with wisdom and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discretion and puts only fit men in all the places. Will that be just government which permits a Republican Governor to exercise supreme police control over cities which have Democratic majorities? Then, too, suppose that Gov. Roosevelt's successor is a Democrat, what will be the condition of Republican cities then?

It is useless to beat about the bush in this matter. The proposal, no matter what form it may take, is for partisan legislation of the most extreme and unjustifiable kind. It would be directly contrary to the spirit of our amended Constitution, which, by giving us separate municipal elections, decreed that we should have better opportunities for securing self-government in cities. It would be as much of a step backward as our new charter-makers took when they restored to us the abomination of a double-chambered Municipal Assembly, for we have tried this method of police control and found it so unsatisfactory that we abandoned it nearly thirty years ago. It has been tried in other States, notably in Massachusetts, and the results are not such as to justify its revival here. If we are to have changes, let them be along the lines of real home rule and in accordance with the teachings of experience. Let the Bureau of Elections be separated from the Police Department entirely, and let the bi-partisan Police Board be replaced by a single Commissioner appointed by the Mayor. Then, if things go wrong, the people of the city will know whom to punish, in case they desire to punish anybody. We shall have just as good a government as we deserve, just as good as we will take the trouble to secure. It will not help matters at all to rid us of the responsibility for the kind of rule we consent to live under.

FRANCE AND ENGLAND.

PARIS, November 15, 1898.

France is awakening from a long dream. The Fashoda incident has taken her completely by surprise, and its termination has been a matter of great confusion. Ever since the war of 1870, France imagined that she had and could have but one enemy; the thought of a war with England never entered her mind. Not that there was anything between France and England like an alliance, or even the *entente cordiale* of the time of Louis Philippe; France thought that her ancient ally of the Crimea had been too indifferent to her misfortunes, and had too readily acquiesced in the hard conditions of the Treaty of Frankfort. But this sentiment did not create any ill-will, as the war of 1870 had really been provoked by the Empire, as it had been short, and as the victories of Prussia had been too crushing to give to the neutral Powers much influence in the result.

Germany remained the only objective of the party which called itself the party of the *revanche;* at the same time, Germany has become so formidable that it was not safe to quarrel with her on any point. It is certainly very remarkable that the French press, unbridled as it is, and the French Parliament, where you can count the firebrands by the dozen, have, as a rule, observed the greatest caution with regard to Germany and to German affairs. Once only has there been a real danger of serious complications between France and Germany —at the time of the Schnaebelé affair; but this was an accident, and served to make the press and Parliament even more cautious than they were before. It must be borne in mind that the system of compulsory and universal military service, established after the war of 1870, has brought home to every village, to every family, the question of peace or war. A continental war, a war with Germany, would mean the immediate mobilization of all our army corps; and, as it is well understood that on the rapidity of mobilization and of concentration depends in a great measure the issue of the war, a universal change in the country would take place in a few days. Such a prospect is so serious that even the press and Parliament have been taught some prudence with regard to Germany.

The combative spirit which has accepted bounds on the side of the Rhine has been diverted in other directions; and whoever is familiar with our press knows that it has thought it perfectly safe to quarrel with England. This paper warfare has continued for years over the heads, it may be said, of the nation, which took but a moderate interest in questions concerning the Capitulations in Tunis, the boundaries of Tonkin and of Cochin-China, the spheres of influence in Siam, in Africa, the competition of France and England in Madagascar. All these questions have, however, been kept alive in the French Foreign Office; but the great *cheval de bataille* has been the Egyptian question, in the press as well as at the Quay d'Orsay. If the country, as a whole, has witnessed with indifference the development of the colonial policy which was inaugurated a few years after the disaster of 1870, this colonial policy has found ardent representatives in the persons chiefly of the courageous explorers—officers of the French navy, of the French army, or enthusiastic civilians—who became the pioneers of France in new regions. There were also politicians who held that if France had been diminished on her Eastern frontiers, she must aggrandize herself in other places. The colonial policy, not very popular at first, became more popular after the annexation of the beautiful province of Tunisia, after the expansion of Tonkin towards China, after the conquest of Madagascar—an immense island which had been coveted by France since the days of Louis XIV.

The Russian alliance having reassured France against the fear of a war with Germany, and even with all the Powers of the Triple Alliance, France had, or thought she had, a free hand in her colonial policy. It was natural that she should think of increasing her already immense possessions on the continent of Africa and of joining them together. The partition of the Dark Continent into "spheres of influence" has been one of the occupations of diplomacy during the latter years of our nineteenth century; a work which will be some day continued by the partition of China into similar spheres. In Africa the problem was rendered the more difficult and the solution more arbitrary by the fact that the geography of the countries subject to partition is to a great degree unknown. It seemed probably safe at first to trace lines in the Dark Continent and to make generous distribution of deserts; to give to the fortunate possessors of the coast unknown "hinterlands." Some far-seeing statesmen (and Lord Salisbury was one of them), however, long ago discerned much danger in these spheres of influence when they should come to be represented by ardent explorers, liable to meet each other where they thought nobody was to be met.

The question of Egypt, and of the occupation of the valley of the Nile by England, has remained for sixteen years a thorn in the flesh not only of African explorers, but of all the French ministers of foreign affairs. The question was at times obscured by other important questions; it remained a sort of substratum to all our relations with England. It constantly remained in the foreground in some of the best French papers; it became for a few political writers a sort of "delenda est Carthago." It is to be feared that what has been a sort of academical question will assume now a more acute form. When the extravagance of the Khedive obliged the European Powers to make a liquidation of the Egyptian finances, some financial organisms were created which are still in existence, and, however strong may now be the position of England, whatever benefits the English administration may have conferred on Egypt, England has not the exclusive command of the finances of the land of the Pharaohs, and the financial questions which may be raised and must be raised from time to time assume at once and perforce an international character. The financial organisms of which I have just spoken stand between England and the protectorate of Egypt, and it is for this reason undoubtedly that Lord Salisbury, in his grave and in parts sibylline speech at the Guildhall, said that he was not prepared to assume for England all the eventualities which might be contained in a formal protectorate.

The French Parliament has shown more wisdom than was to be expected of it, in allowing the Government to abandon Fashoda without any discussion; but this reserve has its explanation in the fact that resistance to the demand of England meant immediate war, and the country was not prepared for it in any sense. The prompt acquiescence in the demand of England gave to French diplomacy a better ground for further discussions of the question of the occupation of Egypt.

I have just said that France was not prepared in any sense; the fact is, that the idea of war with England has never entered any French mind since the days of the Crimea. The relations of France and England are incessant: we copy the English fashions, read English books, are dressed by English tailors; our young people play lawn-tennis and will soon learn to play golf. We are accustomed to see the Prince of Wales in our theatres, in our streets; you cannot walk in Paris without seeing English shops on every side. Tea, which in old times was given in France only to sick people, has become as common a beverage as coffee. We have among us Anglomaniacs, young men who send their linen to London to be washed. We have learned the language of the turf; we have our bars, and jockeys, and race-horses. Paris has an English quarter, English restaurants, English booksellers. A quarrel between France and England has been hither-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to considered as a mere family quarrel; we leave diplomats to settle it as well as they can. And England has sent us, since the war of 1870, diplomats who seemed quite at home among us, who mixed with our best society, whose personal merit was recognized by everybody. Lord Dufferin, Lord Lytton were both great favorites. They never lost an occasion to manifest their sympathy for France; they both belonged to the great republic of letters, which knows no frontiers and no enmities.

It is perhaps because nobody was conscious or aware of any real misunderstanding between France and England that such a misunderstanding was fraught with the more danger. France did not suspect, when she formed an alliance with Russia, that it could not be regarded favorably by England—the Franco-Russian alliance was in her eyes a mere defence against the Triple Alliance. But England had not been accustomed to be left out in the cold; she belonged to none of the two new European constellations; she was, as it were, diplomatically expelled from Europe. Her isolation was not the easy isolation of a Power which has no enemies; Germany had become a commercial rival of hers, and the German Emperor threw his famous gauntlet in her face at the time of the Jameson raid. England was deeply offended by the unnecessary telegram sent by the German Emperor to Krüger. When the Eastern question was reopened by the war in Thessaly, England was not proud of the part which she had to play in a so-called European concert; Germany played a part which renders her the trusted adviser of the Sultan and the virtual commander of the armies of Islam. In one word, England was discontented; she felt that her influence in Europe was not in the ascendant. She found her opportunity in the new combination of forces which took place when the United States entered on the scene. While all the European Powers expressed sympathy for Spain, England took sides immediately, without an hour's hesitation, with the United States. It is needless for me to show here the importance of the great change which a moral alliance of England and of the United States may operate in the world. England feels no longer isolated, and consequently that her hands have become more free.

THE FALL OF THE JAPANESE CABINET.

TOKYO, November 3, 1898.

The party Cabinet that came into power with so much applause in June has reached an inglorious end in a shorter time even than its enemies predicted. Its supporters at the start confidently affirmed that this Cabinet would have a term of six years at least, while its enemies, the Conservatives attached to the old régime, hardly dared to limit its duration to less than two years. A tenure of office lasting scarcely four months has seen the rise, decline, and fall of the first party cabinet in Japan, together with a complete disintegration of the Constitutional party. Continual bickerings between the two wings of this party proved to be the cause of the Cabinet's overthrow. Their mutual jealousy caught at every straw of possible recrimination. Especially the Liberal wing let no opportunity of this kind escape. Count Okuma, the Prime Minister, finally came to the conclusion that he must assert the authority his position gave him, if his Government was to command any respect, or effect any real improvement over the previous Government. Upon his refusal to listen to the advice of the Liberals, the latter at once withdrew their support and the Kenseito came to an end.

The occasion of the final struggle was not a matter of great importance. On the 21st of August the Minister of Education, an adherent of the former Shimpoto, delivered an address in which he declaimed against the money-making propensities of the present generation. Among other things, he said that even in America, where the plutocracy was most powerful, the people did not elect a millionaire to the Presidency, whereas, he thought, if Japan were a republic, the people would be likely to elect the richest man to the highest office. This reference to a republican form of government, coming from a Cabinet Minister, was severely criticised by the old opponents of party government, and was attacked even by members of the Liberal wing of the Kenseito. It is hardly open to question that a good deal of underground intrigue in the court itself was directed against the Minister. The words were held to contain a disrespectful, if not treasonable, reference to the Emperor; but those who gave them this turn must have seen the sophistry of it. Had it not been that the Liberal politicians perceived a vacancy ahead and an opportunity of using it for their own purposes, the cry against this official would probably soon have died a natural death. The occasion, however, was too tempting. Count Okuma's party, the Shimpoto, held a majority of the ministerial offices. The politicians of the Liberal persuasion maintained that a balance of power between the two wings was an indispensable condition of the success of the present Cabinet. Here, then, was an excellent pretext for sacrificing the Minister of Education and giving his place to a candidate of the opposite faction. This manœuvre proved in the end a bombshell to the Cabinet and the Constitutional party.

Some days before the Minister of Education handed in his resignation to the Emperor, a meeting of the extremists of the Liberal section took place in Tokyo. The organ of this faction, a newly established newspaper in Tokyo, declared that this conference was held to suggest some definite line of conduct for the party leaders in the Cabinet. After a long debate on all phases of the complications of the present Government, the members reached the real pith and marrow of the occasion. The chief spokesman of the meeting was the redoubtable Mr. Hoshi, late of Washington, who has been one of the principal critics of Count Okuma and his party. Instead of formulating a policy of action for the present Cabinet, Mr. Hoshi and his henchmen came to the remarkable conclusion that the Cabinet, in making new appointments, must respect the balance of power. Translated into simple English, this statement meant that for every Minister of State or other high official of Progressive extraction the Liberals expected one of their own faction to be appointed. This motion had in view the possible resignation of the Minister of Education, and was clearly directed as a warning to the Prime Minister either to appoint a Liberal to the possible vacancy or to take the consequences.

Probably no demand could have more fatally injured the Cabinet in its most sensitive part. During the entire period of its administration the Okuma Cabinet has been bitterly attacked by the independent press of the country, backed by public opinion, because many of its Ministers toadied to the spoils element and did not reform abuses or establish any constructive policy. What is the use of having abolished the Satcho, said these newspapers, if the abuses of the Satcho continue to flourish? Yet in the face of all these protests the whole purport of the Liberal conference was merely to provoke the further separation of the two factions in the Government and to continue the squabble for office. Mr. Hoshi himself, the leader of this movement, dimly recognized that he was merely enhancing the peril of the situation. He semi-apologetically declared that he himself was not a candidate for any office and was not the originator of the balance-of-power theory, as it existed before he had arrived in Japan.

Just after this meeting the clamors of the Liberals, together with pressure from some court officials (the Kunaisho), succeeded in forcing the Minister of Education to resign. On the question of his successor, it was evident, the leaders of both wings of the Kenseito were determined to stake the continuance of the present Government. The Liberal leader, Count Itagaki, demanded one of his own party to fill the vacancy, while the Prime Minister was equally resolved to appoint one of his own. The Cabinet meeting held to discuss this point ended in a complete breach between the two leaders and the two factions. The Prime Minister promptly recommended his own candidate to the Emperor, who at once endorsed the recommendation. A little later, when Count Itagaki appeared before the Emperor to protest against this appointment, he found that he had been forestalled. Thereupon, on the 27th of October, the Liberal leader, together with two Ministers and other high officials of the same camp, handed in their resignations. All efforts of the Emperor to reconcile the two leaders were unsuccessful, and it was left to the Prime Minister either to reconstruct his Cabinet on party lines or resign. Count Okuma boldly took the former course. On the 29th he made up a list of candidates of his own party for the vacancies and submitted it to the Emperor.

The Liberals in the meantime had not been idle. It had been previously agreed that a general meeting of the Kenseito was to be held on the 1st of November. When on the 28th of October the resignation of the Minister of Education and the split in the Cabinet became known, the Liberal members of the committee of the Kenseito found a quorum and agreed to call a meeting immediately, at which the question of the amalgamated party's existence should be the main topic of discussion. The Progressive members of this committee who demurred did not affect the majority, and the meeting was called for the following day. At this conference only Liberals were present, but as the proceedings were legally in order they claimed to represent the Constitutional party. After listening to a detailed statement of the facts that led to the rupture in the Cabinet, the motion was made that the representatives of the Kenseito present have the power of dissolving that party. As soon as this motion was carried and the party formally dissolved, another motion was carried to the effect that a new party be organized under the same name (Kenseito) and with a new executive committee, from

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which, as a matter of course, all Progressives were carefully excluded. The Liberals, probably under advice of the astute Mr. Hoshi, had stolen a march on their confrères of the opposite camp: they took possession of the offices, money, and seals of the Kenseito, and were the *de-facto* possessors of the party titles and authority.

It was just after this meeting that the most surprising turn of all was given to political affairs in the capital. The newspapers reported that the Emperor was delaying the confirmation of the nominations of the Prime Minister to the vacancies caused by the secession of the Liberals. This rumor proved too true. The delay was equivalent to a hint that a Cabinet composed entirely of Progressive elements was not entirely agreeable to his Majesty, or at least to his immediate advisers at the court. The Emperor, after the resignation of the Liberal Ministers, sent repeatedly to Count Itagaki to inquire whether he would not reconsider his determination to secede from the Cabinet. Never before has the Emperor entered so far into the arena of actual politics in order to maintain a Cabinet. When he or his immediate advisers, however, saw that Count Itagaki's decision was irrevocable, either he or they determined not to submit the Government to Count Okuma unless they were compelled by new emergencies. It is known that Count Okuma is not a *persona grata* in the Imperial household. The rather bold and uncompromising methods of the Count are not agreeable to the body of Conservatives in the court, who wish to conduct their affairs without interference from him. As soon, however, as the Emperor's hesitation to confirm the nominations of the Prime Minister was made known to the Cabinet, all the Ministers in a body on the last day of October sent in their resignations.

The only persons who emerge from the wreck comparatively clean of all weakness or intrigue are Count Okuma and some members of his party. The Liberals are the chief offenders. Their talk about the balance of power was merely a "nice" phrase to conceal a "nasty" idea—namely, the spoils of office. Clearly, the Kenseito was a party or it was nothing. If the former, all its members should loyally have worked for the united party and not for the balance of power; if the latter, better dissolution at once. The Liberals have been disunionists from the start. Count Itagaki, in his letter of resignation, writes in a way that is scarcely manly. He deplores the fact that he cannot save the Cabinet from disruption, and guard his Majesty from anxiety on this score. Count Okuma's determination, on the other hand, to appoint his candidate and so stop the continual wrangling about the disposition of the offices is one of the manliest acts that have been witnessed for a long time in Japanese politics. His letter of resignation has a sound ring in it—just the note that is needed at present. The greatest evil to-day in the administration of Japan is lack of decision and responsibility—deficiencies that are often disguised under such fine imported words as "compromise," "balance of power," and the like. Count Okuma is not a man of this kidney, and, though he has raised a clamor against himself, he will in the end be respected the more.

The court is guilty of an inconsistency in at first accepting the Prime Minister's appointment to the Educational Department, and then in refusing to back him up when he was ready to take all the consequences of this step. Some Japanese say that the Emperor was badly advised—a very significant manner of speech in Japan. For the present the forces hostile to Count Okuma are in the ascendant, but it is hardly hazardous to prophesy that the time will come when he will again be called to the helm, and when that moment arrives he will not accept until he can take the place on his own conditions. The Liberals are now joining forces with the very class of statesmen they were but so lately denouncing. Either Marquis Ito or Marquis Yamagata will probably form a Cabinet and rely for support in the Lower House upon the Liberal vote, but this compact must always be a feeble one; and when it is dissolved, Count Okuma's opportunity will have come. As Marquis Ito is now returning from China it is just barely possible that he may, on his arrival, lend his influence to the now resigned Okuma Cabinet. Should he do this, the whole trend of politics in Japan will receive a fresh and powerful impulse that will last as long as parliamentary government remains in the experimental stage. G. D.

Correspondence.

THE "OPEN DOOR."

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: To those who think of what Epictetus meant by "an open door" that expression is now ominously suggestive, as *national* suicide is not unknown in history, and we may reach it quickly in our land-grabbing designs on the Philippines and the Carolines and Borrioboola Gha.—Yours, etc.,

W. W. C.

Baltimore, November 24, 1898.

IMPERIAL FATALISM.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Has there ever been a stranger illustration of "Speech is silver, but silence is golden" than we to-day afford in our attempts to get discussion over a national policy? The Americans who realize the gravity of the undertaking which America (in its ideal sense) represents, have tried to argue with the expansionist. They have cited history, have dwelt on the principles on which our political structure rests, have exposed the bubble nature of the expansionist's plans, and yet the expansionist is unaffected. "No matter how this problem is settled, I believe the nation will prosper. I believe God has yet a work for America to do, and that we shall go on as we have gone on," said a preacher in my hearing recently. This attitude of the pious expansionist is not Christian, but that of a pagan fatalist or eighteenth-century deist. Ever since Ezekiel said, "The soul that sinneth it shall die," the religion that makes men has laid stress on personal responsibility. It has ascribed personality to its God; it has freed the conception of God from inconsistency; it has gloried in "Prove me, saith the Lord," for such a view made it worth while for men to try to be like Him. Fatalism, or destiny, as it is now called, takes no account of persons—likens them to dice thrown by a player for some end of his own. The destiny-expansionist "trusts in God," but his god is an impersonal and unknown force. He does not trust in principles of life; he does not have faith in a course of action which, followed to the end, promises some definite mastery of evil, some definite victory of good. He thinks "it" will work for him, and let him follow after and pick up the goods.

Our fathers thought our nation was founded on righteous principles, and would endure (in its original intent) so long as we were faithful to those principles. To-day the pious fatalist tells us we are but playthings in the hands of destiny; that whether we "swear to our own hurt and change not" or perjure ourselves, whether we hold that government exists by consent of the governed, or that this is true only of ourselves and not of "niggers" and Filipinos—in both cases it is a matter of indifference to "Destiny."

As there is no argument for a sneer, neither is there one for fatalism. The only way to bring the expansion-fatalist to deliberate is to block his way with a human will. One emphatic "No," such as Senator Hoar has uttered, makes the fatalist who fancies Destiny overrides all human wills cast about for human means to break through the obstacle. And this entrance of the expansionist into a rational state is what is now so needed, for it brings him back to history and experience, matters that are trifles to his unpolitical mind, and in this field he may take his place—behind men of saner judgment. Let us uphold Hoar, Reed, and their associates, and the danger may be averted. Frank Drew.

Worcester, Mass., November 25, 1898.

"COÖPERATION" AND AFTER.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: While sharing your views in regard to a policy of colonial expansion in general and the undesirability of the Phillippines as a permanent acquisition, it seems to me that certain considerations touching this question have escaped your attention.

On the 14th day of August the United States Government established order and law in Manila. For the first time in its history the city is clean; for the first time in its history merchants, European or Asiatic, are able to ply their vocations in a spirit of tranquillity, undisturbed by dread of official rapacity and spoliation. The monstrous cruelty of Spanish priests, exercised for centuries upon the rural population with impunity, is at an end; some glimmering of the meaning of personal liberty penetrates even the dull brain of the Tagal, and there is manifest a more enlightened and humane influence than this unhappy country has ever felt. Such, in brief, are the results of an occupation extending over the short period of two months.

Consider for a moment the consequences which would follow the restoration of power to the Spaniards. Encamped not two miles from the outskirts of the various suburbs lies the insurgent army, an armed rabble of twenty or thirty thousand men; it was a bitter disappointment to them to be compelled to abandon their intention of looting the city. Nothing but a wholesome fear of American marksmanship has curbed this intention and prevented them from forcing their way in. Evacuate the Intramuenta and the forts, restore the captured Mausers, and let the last troopship disappear behind Corregi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dor, how long would the Spanish garrison, enfeebled by sickness, discouraged by defeat and inertia, be able to keep this mob at bay? It would be tantamount to delivering Manila over to pillage, to inflicting loss, suffering, and death upon thousands of innocent people. The Filipinos—not Aguinaldo's malcontents, but quiet, law-abiding tradespeople, accountants, artisans, representative of the intelligence of Manila—have sworn never again to submit to Spanish rule. To avert such a misfortune, they have no alternative but expatriation or death.

Have we, therefore, the right to desert a people whose safety and welfare depend so directly upon our resolute coöperation? The American people must decide whether the expressed determination to abstain from territorial aggrandizement outweighs a responsibility imposed upon them by the hazard of war. ARTHUR HUGH FRAZIER,
1st Co. U. S. Vol. Signal Corps.

MANILA, October 16, 1898.

["Coöperation," "The American people must decide"; these are strange terms, and, in the mouth of our correspondent, show how far away Manila is. "Military subjection" and "McKinley has decided" are now the only watchwords.—ED. NATION.]

AMERICA'S MISSION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The following description of the people of this country as they were when they formed the Constitution, has an interest of appositeness at this time, when they are on the verge of altering it.

M. Louis Simond, an intelligent French traveller of the last decade of the last century, says:

"Rich and populous as the United States are destined to be, in an extraordinary degree, their power [of offence] will never be in any proportion. . . . The United States will ever feel an aversion to taxes . . . or a government strong enough to make the people fight and pay. . . . Every new generation there comes into life to enjoy it—to increase and multiply in peace and obscurity, in abundance and security—and leave, at the call of nature alone, a life of content, exposed to few sacrifices, as well as spent without much glory."

It does not seem to have occurred, even to a Frenchman, and one of the Napoleonic era, that a people such as is here described would ever deliberately (if the word may be used to describe the process) forfeit such exemptions as he enumerates, to attain such a desideratum as he implies, "glory"!

Permit me to somewhat lengthen my note in order to ask a question intimately connected with it. When those who made our country spoke of its "destiny" and "duty," they had a definite meaning. What that was is clearly stated by Hamilton in the first paragraph of the first number of the first general treatise on our Constitution, the 'Federalist.' He says:

"It seems to have been reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example, to decide the important question, whether societies of men are really capable or not of establishing good government from reflection and choice, or whether they are for ever destined to depend for their political constitution on accident and force."

This, if "inglorious," is, at least, definite. But, when the Rev. Soandso informs us that we should not shrink from our manifest destiny by failing to grab all we can, what does he mean? That it is our duty to extend the blessings we enjoy, over recalcitrant communities, as the Inquisition extended the consolations of religion, or as we have already done over the Indians? When the Hon. Suchaone exhorts us not to fail in our high mission (also by any failure to appropriate our neighbor's property), what does he mean? That we should extend the blessings of liberty, equality, and fraternity (as understood by himself and other honorable gentlemen) *vi et armis*, as the French republicans extended them over Germany, etc.? Whatever their meaning, it certainly is *not* Hamilton's, "to decide by example that societies of men are not destined to depend for their political constitution on force," but is, on the contrary, so much opposed to that principle as to give his succeeding words the force of prophecy. "If there be any truth in this remark [as to the destiny of America]," he continues, "the crisis at which we are arrived may with propriety be regarded as the era in which that decision is to be made; and a wrong election of the part we shall act may, in this view, deserve to be considered as the general misfortune of mankind."—Respectfully, BUNFORD SAMUEL.

PHILADELPHIA, November 21, 1898.

THE SOUTH AND CHEAP COTTON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The present price of cotton is the lowest on record. The money that cotton now nets is even much less than the low price of middling cotton indicates. The continued rainy weather has lowered the grade greatly, so that much cotton is now netting 3¾c. on the plantation. The cotton that is to come will average low, and its abundance will cause its relative decline in price to middling cotton. The price of cotton seed is also at low-water mark.

Five years ago such a condition of affairs would have been paralyzing, yet now the prosperity of the South is not shaken. Farmers will pay out of debt. There will be no suffering, as the country is full to overflowing with hog, hominy, and sorghum. The South's financial condition is better than it has ever been. The reason is that cotton, more than ever before, is a surplus or money crop. Farmers do not go nearly so deeply into debt to make it as they used to do. It is also true that the preceding three years have been prosperous ones.

In reality the low price will be ultimately a benefit. New impetus will be given the growing movement towards crop diversification. Especial interest prevails in regard to grasses and stock, because of the high price of cattle prevailing. Crop diversification is to a slight extent retarded by organizations of planters themselves. They meet and resolve to restrict next season's crop and diversify their products. Each planter goes home secretly resolved to plant more cotton as he believes the acreage will be restricted. They don't seem to learn; they aid what they seek to prevent. It is such a simple and well-understood economic truth, too. They can't learn from well-emphasized lessons that each one must work out his own salvation.

A vital fact in connection with the cotton crop that has not received due attention is the matter of picking. There is a limit to the size of the crop the South can pick. Last year, with almost ideal weather conditions, eleven million two hundred thousand (11,200,000) bales was gathered; it was late in the spring before it was all in. The unusual sight was presented of planting and picking in the same field. It was declared the crop limit for gathering had been reached. I believe this to be correct.

This season, except in Texas, the weather for picking has been bad. From the bottoms comes the general complaint of the great scarcity of hands. Yet the price for picking is as high as it was when cotton was worth double. It takes about 50 per cent. of the value of a bale of cotton alone to pick it now. The great amount of levee building with good wages attracts some, the outrageous tariff which the "roustabout" can tax the steamboats in the fall leads others, and the increasing timber and manufacturing interests absorb others. The scarcity of labor is a serious problem for the cotton planter. W. COLLIER ESTES.

MEMPHIS, November 19, 1898.

SHELLEY IN AMERICA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your review, "Griswold and his Times," in your issue of the 17th inst., I notice that Horace Greeley, in a letter to Griswold in 1845, states that there was not a copy of Shelley's poems to be had in New York at that time, and presumably not in the (entire) country. Mr. Greeley, in this as in other instances, was more positive than accurate. I possess a copy of the poems of Shelley, published in Philadelphia in 1832 by Grigg & Elliott. Possibly in those days a period longer than thirteen years was required for literature to reach New York from Philadelphia.

If Mr. Griswold was then in Philadelphia under request to write satirical letters to the *Tribune*, he assuredly had one item supplied, though its point would likely have provoked non-poetic expletives from the seeker for spice and satire.—Very respectfully yours,
FRANK TITUS.

KANSAS CITY, MO., November 21, 1898.

M C M.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will the year 1900 be, written in Roman numerals, only MCM? In more modern times, at least, all analogies point that way; as may be seen in IV, IX, XI, and XC. To those who have toiled with chisel or graver at dates like MDCCCLXXXVIII a contrast so rarely brief would be indeed a boon; while even for MCMI, MCMV, or MCMX they could still give thanks.

Will not some correspondent who is well up in his epitaphs and inscriptions of the tenth century, or even of the fifteenth, kindly throw light for others besides? Q.

BOSTON, November 23, 1898.

WOMEN IN THE ISLAND OF COS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In an account of a journey to the islands of the Ægean (in the November *Rundschau*, p. 209) Rudolf Lindau makes the interesting statement that, on the island of Cos, not the son but the daughter inherits from the parents, and, instead of the man wooing the girl, the latter has the right of choosing her husband. In a somewhat extensive list of works on the history of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

woman in ancient and modern times no mention is made, so far as I remember, of such traces of gynecocracy among *civilized* peoples of our own day, and possibly this apparently well-authenticated fact is not as well known as it deserves to be. It would be interesting to learn whether this exceptional legal custom is of recent origin or a relic of ancient times. The writer in the *Rundschau* also remarks (p. 210) that women, and especially unmarried women, on the island, in spite of their being thus favored by the law, would violate social custom by appearing in public places. L.

YPSILANTI, MICH., November 20, 1898.

Notes.

A new edition of Herbert Spencer's 'Biology,' with important revision and enlargement, is about to appear in the first volume announced by D. Appleton & Co.

Maynard, Merrill & Co. have in press 'Yale Verse,' compiled by Charles E. Merrill, jr.

L. C. Page & Co., Boston, will make another venture with Omar's Rubáiyát, in Edward Heron-Allen's edition, which contains a facsimile of the Persian MS. in the Bodleian, together with a transcript into modern Persian characters and a literal translation into English.

'The Divine Force in the Life of the World,' Lowell Institute Lectures by Alexander McKenzie, D.D.; 'Washington the Soldier,' by Gen. Henry B. Carrington; and 'Wishmakers' Town,' poems by William Young, will be published directly by L. C. Page & Co.

Ginn & Co. have nearly ready 'Colonial Life in New Hampshire,' by James H. Fassett, and 'The World's Painters and their Pictures,' by Deristhe L. Hoyt.

A new Boston firm, Brown & Co., starts out with 'American Naval Heroes,' by John Howard Brown; 'Where to Educate,' a guide to private schools in this country; and 'Through the Year with Kipling,' a volume of selections.

With each year a fresh reprint of one of John Fiske's historical works is to be expected from Houghton, Mifflin & Co., revised as to the text and rationally illustrated. Hence we now have his 'Beginnings of New England.' Regarding the illustrations, Mr. Fiske points out the paucity of portrait material in the fore part of the period he deals with, and he has sought to make amends for it by many interesting views of seventeenth-century houses still or till lately standing, and by numerous facsimiles of title-pages of early printed books, which literally speak "volumes" as to the times in which they appeared. We have only praise for the principle of selection observed in this new series. Occasionally we might wish (when an original canvas was at hand, as in the case of Increase Mather) that a photogravure had replaced even a recent engraving. The index is hardly up to the level of the general excellence of this edition.

The illustrations to the first and second series of Dean Farrar's 'Cathedrals of England,' as now issued by Thomas Whittaker, are somewhat heterogeneous in origin. A large number and the best proceed from Herbert Railton. They are all pen-and-ink sketches, and, though frequently concerned with architectural details, have mostly only a pictorial and decorative value.

Macmillan Co. give a beautiful dress to James Lane Allen's 'Choir Invisible,' of which the embellishment has fallen to Orson Lowell. He offers specimens of his skill both with the pen and in wash drawing reproduced by photogravure, and while these latter full-page designs are respectable, though uneven and marred at times by a forced perspective, the artist is evidently most at home in line. Mr. Lowell's vignettes and head and tailpieces are graceful and effective.

A happy journey, without accident, of nearly seventeen thousand miles, from Philadelphia to Japan, via Hawaii, and back, made between May and November, 1896, is described by Charles M. Taylor, jr., in a brightly illustrated and gayly stamped book, entitled 'Vacation Days in Hawaii and Japan' (Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs & Co.). The narrative is wholly devoid of literary quality.

This cannot be charged against Edward Lowe Temple's 'Old World Memoirs' (Boston: L. C. Page & Co.), which is yet dry as a guide-book from sheer force of cramming. The two pretty volumes are well illustrated.

Major-General Joseph Wheeler is already out with his promised history of 'The Santiago Campaign' (Boston: Lamson, Wolffe & Co.). It is little more than a compilation of official dispatches, most of which have already been published, united by a running commentary in Gen. Wheeler's well-known vein of cheerful optimism. In fact, the book makes him out a delightful combination of Mark Tapley and *preux chevalier*. He has but one regret to express, personally, and that is that he was reported ill. To be sure, he had a nasty fever, and he had to take a lot of medicine and give up tree-climbing and riding in the sun; but he did not go off duty for two hours, and just enjoyed hearing the Mausers whiz and digging trenches all night. The dispatches he publishes show in what a state of daze the Commanding General found himself on July 2 and 3; but there is no doubt about Gen. Wheeler. He was the spryest, readiest, cheeriest youth of sixty-one in the whole army.

The State of New York has just issued the first volume of the Public Papers of Daniel D. Tompkins, with an introduction by Hugh Hastings, "State Historian." These papers were purchased from James Brooks, and comprise originals and copies of Tompkins's correspondence when Governor of New York and Vice-President. From the military papers a selection has been made, and this stout volume of leaded matter is the result. To any one who has occasion to study the service of the New York militia in the war of 1812, this collection will be of value. It is to be regretted that the remarkable performances of the "State Historian" should be printed in connection with it. His introduction is a good example of everything that is not history, and, together with the sensational captions to the letters, unites ignorance and vulgarity in discrediting the issues of the State made through Mr. Hastings's office. Comparison of his work with that of O'Callaghan or Fernow in the same field offers much food for reflection.

'Work and Play in Girls' Schools,' by three head-mistresses, Dorothea Beale, Lucy H. M. Soulsby, and Jane Frances Dove (Longmans, Green & Co.), aims explicitly at giving assistance to teachers in the secondary schools for girls, which are so rapidly supplanting the governess in England, and, barring its sentimental tone, is an interesting exhibition of the present status of that phase of the education of women. American teachers will be interested in noting the frequent references made to American methods and treatises, and amused by finding that England is not free from that well-known obstacle to pedagogic progress, the parent.

Volume i. of Prof. W. B. Smith's 'Infinitesimal Analysis' (Macmillan) promises a work of much merit. But we cannot express a definitive opinion until we see the whole work.

Viewed as a text-book for students, Prof. Mansfield Merriman's 'Elements of Sanitary Engineering' (John Wiley & Sons) seems an attempt to perform a hopeless task. It combines some of the elements of hygiene, bacteriology, chemistry, physics, hydraulics and other important branches of civil engineering, mechanics, street-sweeping, garbage disposal, and municipal economics, all in a little over 200 pages. The fruitlessness of carrying a student over too much ground should be kept clearly in view. It is only what he mentally assimilates that serves him in after life. The profession of engineering is so broad that the student cannot successfully be even introduced to the whole of it, and rarely does his college education determine the special field of his practice. His best equipment is a fairly liberal education, with a good knowledge of mathematics, physics, mechanics, and the broader principles of his profession, an insight into methods of investigation, a habit of close observation, and a good fund of common sense. The rest he will acquire as he has need of it. A bibliography of each subject would have increased the usefulness of the present work.

M. Charles Lenient has followed up his two well-known volumes on French Comedy in the Eighteenth Century with two others on 'La Comédie en France au XIXe siècle' (Paris: Hachette). The title, however, is somewhat misleading, for the author does not touch upon any author after Alfred de Musset, and leaves the whole of the second half of the century out of consideration. He gives abundant space to the comedy of the Empire, the Restoration, and the July Monarchy, Scribe receiving an amount of attention which compensates in some measure for the bitter attacks of which he has been the victim. It is to be hoped that M. Lenient may be spared to write the history of French comedy during the second half of the century.

A new literary venture of a rather ambitious character is the monthly journal *Der Türmer*, published by Greiner & Pfeiffer of Stuttgart, and edited by Jeannot Emil Freiherr von Grotthuss. The first number, of 96 pages octavo, appeared in October, with a good portrait of Goethe. The contents appeal to a large audience of thoughtful readers, the special aim of the periodical evidently being not so much to report the facts of modern life and thought as to understand and to interpret them. Its general tone and tendency are accordingly philosophical, and its purpose is to be perfectly impartial and scientific. Criticisms of books and discussions of the religious, political, and literary fields belong to the regular programme. The first number contains, among other things, the opening chapters of a novel by Ernst Eckstein and an article on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Buddha by L. von Schroeder. A number of lesser contributions are from the pen of the editor, who, however, writes in rather a *burschikos* and dogmatic style. In character and contents, the new journal has great similarity to *Nord und Süd.*

The regular record of recent additions to the Boston Public Library is supplemented in the November Bulletin by a list of some five hundred titles of books on landscape gardening. This is a collection given by Mr. and Mrs. James M. Codman "in memory of their sons Henry Sargent and Philip Codman, landscape architects."

The Rutherfurd Astronomical Photographs, presented by the late Lewis M. Rutherfurd to the Observatory of Columbia University, form the subject of four papers in volume 10 of the Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. Other papers are: "The Nature and Origin of Stipules," by A. A. Tyler, and "The Ascidian Half-Embryo," by Henry E. Crampton, jr. The announcement is made that, with the issue of volume 16, the publication of the Transactions of the Academy is discontinued. The Annals will appear with new forms of typography and arrangement of matter, and the Memoirs in quarto shape will be published at irregular intervals.

Consular Reports for November contains an account of the "Financial Conditions in Chili," by our Minister, H. L. Wilson, in which he says that "the small tradesmen, artisans, and people of the working classes generally . . . appear to universally favor the gold standard, and oppose with extreme bitterness an issue of paper money by the Government." A petition of "the laborers" of Santiago presented to the President of Chili on July 20 is appended, one suggestion of which is that, "in case paper money reappears, it should not exist for a long period, and should not be of a less legal value than 18d." Some manufacturers of Austria and Hungary, a consul writes, in order to obtain a share of foreign commerce, are about to send a floating exposition of sample products to the Far East. A large steamer fitted with booths will sail from Trieste in December, and will visit, among other ports, Constantinople, Bombay, Calcutta, Singapore, Canton, Port Arthur, and Yokohama, returning in six months. The Government has granted a subsidy of $20,300 in aid of the expedition. There is also an abstract of a report on the "further-developing" schools of Saxony. These, in number 1,953, with 77,057 pupils, are for the graduates of the common schools, and are distinct from the industrial and technical schools. Attendance is compulsory, and "manufacturers, merchants, etc., are made responsible for the attendance of the boys in their employ, and the latter make a special study of the trade in which they are occupied." Attention is also called to the fact that our Government has been officially notified "that the entry of foreign Israelites into Palestine is prohibited, and that the imperial authorities have received orders to prevent the landing of Jewish emigrants."

The days of literary frauds are evidently not yet passed, notwithstanding the critical tendencies of the age; nor is it necessary to go for these to Egypt or to the Orient, where the professionals in this line of business still flourish and are so expert in their business as to deceive the very elect. The trial and conviction of a culprit of this kind in the German capital recently has demonstrated the fact that even the regular book trade can be swindled. A husband and wife were charged with having sold to the Hamburg City Library five volumes of Augustine's works as having formed part of Martin Luther's private library, his name in his own hand being written in them. On account of these historical associations the price secured was 290 marks. The same couple had managed to sell the well-known house of Ulrico Hoepli, in Milan, another similar lot for 1,000 lire. The imitations were clever, but the chemist Dr. Jeserich soon demonstrated their fraudulent character. As the woman was really the guilty party, the court decreed imprisonment of ten months.

—The third volume of the second series of the 'Index-Catalogue of the Library of the Surgeon-General's Office' comprises the letter C in 1,100 quarto pages. As we turn them over we are impressed anew with the rare character of this unrivailed collection. In a merely bibliographical point of view it holds a high rank, and the student of early printed works will find in it a mine of material. Take Roussetus's 'Hysterotomotokia': here are editions of Basle, 1588; Paris, 1590; and Frankfort, 1601. Or take Peter Camper's Dissertation on the natural varieties in the physiognomy of mankind: we have it in his original Dutch, Utrecht, 1791; in French, the same place and year (and also Paris, but the translation is by another hand); finally, in English, a new (London) edition, 1821. So John Kaye's (Caius) 'De Medendi Methodo' may be consulted in editions at Basle, from Frobenius's press, 1544; at Louvain, 1556; and in English, 'A boke, or counseill against the disease commonly called The Sweate,' 1552. A much longer list might be cited for Celsus's 'De Medicina,' coming down from Milan, 1481; Venice, 1493 and 1528; Paris, 1529, etc. Human delusions and superstitions may be studied in John Cardilucius's 'Historische Exempel,' showing that comets too (*auch die Cometen*) must be reckoned among the causes of the plague; or in 'A certaine relation of the hog-faced gentlewoman called Mistris Tannakin Skinker,' "who was bewitched in her mother's wombe in the yeare 1618." Chocolate was described in its nature and qualities in a Spanish work of 1631, translated into Latin and French, as here recorded. In 1636 A. de Leon Pinelo proposed the 'Question moral' whether a churchman's fast was broken by taking chocolate. Yellow fever appears to have been late in acquiring its name; Mathew Cary's account of the epidemic in Philadelphia in 1795 speaks of it as the "malignant" fever. This narrative was reproduced in the same city and in Lancaster in French and in German; in 1830 it was reprinted with "yellow" in the title-page. Sociologists will find much to interest them in this catalogue: witness a work on saving-banks in Paris in 1844, Miss Frances Power Cobbe's 'Friendless Girls and How to Help Them,' and many other entries. The rubric Children fills 31 pages. Crimes, Congresses, Cookery, Crowds (thanks to Le Bon) are significant divisions. The index to periodical literature shows the course of current medical discussion to perfection. New classifications indicate the march of medical science and discovery. Cocaine, which hardly obtained a footing in the first series, here demands nine pages. Finally, we remark the extension of the previous collection of portraits, with dates, place of publication, name of engraver, etc., when known.

—'Architecture among the Poets' is the title of a little book by H. Heathcote Statham, author of the best book that has been published on modern architecture, and of other important works. It is published by Batsford in London and by Charles Scribner's Sons in New York. The subject is one which it would be easy to make ridiculous, for it involves exactly that kind of compilation which so many uninformed contributors to magazines find quite within their reach. A moderately large village library will contain all the books cited by Mr. Statham, and the enthusiastic description or purely accidental reference of a poet may easily be accepted by the amateur critic as being in itself solid criticism. Mr. Statham, however, is otherwise minded, and otherwise furnished for his task. He is for this purpose, primarily, a student of architecture of all epochs and of all styles, and, secondarily, a respectful and sympathetic reader of what the poets have had to say about it. The book is, therefore, a curious judgment on the poet and his insight, or lack of insight. One might almost say that our judgment of Longfellow, or of Lord Houghton, or of Tennyson, or Browning is to be suspended until we can note the truthfulness of the dictum which each of these poets has to offer upon some architectural monument. Thus, Lord Houghton blunders lamentably over the original suggestion of Gothic vaulting, and, on the other hand, has in his poem, "The Flowers of Helicon," a wise and curiously prophetic series of remarks about the influence of Grecian art upon the Roman and post-Roman world; and it does seem as if one ought to consider the mental process involved in the blunder, and that shown in the wiser poem, before completing his estimate of Monckton Milnes as a writer. What is said in this book about these contrasting passages and about many such passages by other writers is nearly always at once shrewd and accurate. So the remarks about Scott's appreciation of mediæval architecture are extremely intelligent, although one could wish for a little further comment upon the poet's absolute misunderstanding of certain buildings and of certain features of a building—a misunderstanding odd in a man gifted with so remarkable an imaginative insight as Scott. It was not the custom in the early years of the present century for literary men to think much or often of the practical pursuits of the builder or of the actual character of a building; otherwise Scott would hardly have represented a castle such as he makes Rokeby to be, nor, we may say, that which his prose makes Torquilstone to be, as completely destroyed and falling in crumbling ruin through the effects of fire. That part of the book which may seem the most novel to our readers is that which deals with the writers before Byron who cared about architecture and wrote of it with intelligence. These, indeed, are surprisingly numerous, and the passages here quoted are singularly interesting.

—Now that Tissot's drawings of the Life of Christ are on exhibition in New York, those who have been puzzled by their singular lack of effectiveness, and the absence of any emotion but that of curiosity with which one regards them, may be interested to recall what the greatest of critics wrote more than forty years ago on the application of ar-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chæology and local color to Biblical subjects in 'A Summer in the Sahara.' Fromentin has compared the life of the Arab to that of the Patriarchs, and so is led to discuss the modern effort to introduce exact Oriental costume into sacred art. "My opinion of the system," he says, "is this: The men of genius are always right and the men of talent are often wrong. To costume the Bible is to destroy it, as to dress a demigod is to make a man of him. . . . But as the idea must in some shape be clothed, the masters have understood that to chasten and simplify the form—that is, to suppress all local color—is to remain as near as possible to the truth. . . . Outside of what is general there is no truth possible, . . . and decidedly we must renounce the illustration of the Bible or undertake it in the spirit of Raphael and Poussin. . . . The people of the East do, indeed, possess a true grandeur, . . . but if, more often than others, they approach the epic style, it is by the very absence of all costume—that is, by ceasing in a manner to be Arab by becoming merely human. Before the half-nakedness of a shepherd I may dream of Jacob; with the bournous of Sahara or the mach'la of Syria one can never represent anything but Bedouins."

—It is true that Fromentin is speaking of the Old Testament, but what he says applies to the illustration of the New Testament also. The more we are convinced by archæology and accuracy of local color that certain events actually happened in Palestine in the first century, the more foreign to us those events are made to seem, and religious emotion evaporates precisely in proportion as the appetite for realism is satisfied. Two methods only have been found by which Bible stories may be so represented in art as to seem of importance to us, to be our religion, to be not actual but true. The one is the method of Raphael, which abstracts all local color and makes the event general and typical and true for all mankind; the other is the method of Rembrandt and of some of the early Italians, who frankly gave the event depicted in the surroundings and with the local color of the artist's own time, and made it seem to belong specifically to the spectator, and to be true especially for him. This method has been tried in our own day, but either we are not sufficiently naïve to accept it or the artist has not been sufficiently sincere to enforce it, and the results have not been happy, though perhaps Millet, if he had gone further in that direction, might have succeeded. It would seem that the method of abstract representation is the only feasible one for us, and that, of the New Testament as of the Old, it remains true that we "must renounce its illustration or undertake it in the spirit of Raphael and Poussin."

—The Norwegian poet and political leader, Björnstjerne Björnson, recently was a chief actor in a somewhat sensational suit for slander which he caused to be entered in the courts of Munich against Dr. J. A. Mordtmann, the managing editor of the *Neueste Nachrichten*, a prominent journal of that city. What made the affair assume practically international importance was its bearing on the Dreyfus case. At the time when the Zola trial occupied the public mind, the Norwegian novelist, who happened to be in Munich, wrote to Zola, with whom he enjoys a personal and literary friendship extending over many years, and congratulated him on his firmness, adding, too, the noteworthy statement that the German Imperial Chancellor, Prince Hohenlohe, when lately in Munich, had said to a prominent gentleman of that city, that Dreyfus was innocent as far as Germany was concerned, and that the Chancellor had mentioned the name of the guilty person. He concluded: "But watch; the French will never revise the trial. Dreyfus must die as did the Nazarene, for the sins of others." This letter of Björnson's made the rounds of the press and naturally excited the greatest interest, especially in Germany and France. Among the papers that censured the above statement most strongly as a fabrication was the *Neueste Nachrichten*. In bringing suit, Björnson did not hesitate to mention the painter Lenbach as his authority, and demanded that the Chancellor be cited as a witness. The trial came to a rather sudden and unexpected end through what was evidently a compromise. Björnson agreed to accept an apology from Mordtmann for the manner in which the editor had attacked his personal honor, and an acknowledgment that he had acted throughout in good faith; but Mordtmann expressly refused to admit that his criticism of the fact itself was erroneous. Björnson also agreed, under these conditions, to pay all the costs. The question whether the Chancellor had or had not made the remarkable statement in question, did not receive the airing which the public was anxiously expecting.

—Now that "1898 D Q," the so-called and as yet unnamed planet discovered by Herr Witt of Berlin last August, has been observed long enough to enable its path round the sun to be ascertained with some approach to accuracy, we note the exceptional interest with which this asteroid has been greeted by the astronomical world, chiefly because of its very near approach to our globe once every thirty years. Rather unfortunately it came to this favorable proximity about five years ago, so that the early part of 1924 is the next opportunity of this happy character—happy because the earthward approach of a truly planetary body to a distance only one-third as great as that of Mars at its nearest means a very pronounced earth-perturbation of its motion, and consequent opportunities of reducing to narrow limits the margin of error now affecting our measures of the sun's distance. The little planet consumes one and three-quarters years in journeying once completely round the sun; and its aphelion recession carries it far beyond Mars, even at his remotest from us. Variation between these wide extremes of distance suggests many important problems to the astrophysicist, among them a test of the question whether an absorbing medium pervades the solar system. It is well to call attention to a widespread error regarding the new planet. Although its mean distance from the sun is only 1.46 times that of the earth, and that of Mars is 1.52, nevertheless the path of D Q is far from lying wholly within the orbit of Mars; the reason being that, while the orbits of both these bodies are very eccentrically placed round the sun, their perihelion points fall on opposite sides of that luminary, so that only about half the orbit of D Q lies within the path of Mars. Almost visible to the naked eye, as the new planet must have been in 1894, it is rather remarkable that it should have escaped detection then. Two years hence a fairly favorable opposition takes place, the distance from us being about 31 million miles, or nearly four millions less than that of Mars at his most auspicious oppositions in 1892 and 1907. Although probably less than 20 miles in diameter, D Q will require as keen watching and as prolonged calculation as if it were one of the massive planets of our system; but it is vastly more worth this care than any others of its congeners, now nearly 450 in number, 92 of which have been found in the past eleven years by M. Charlois of Nice, the most successful of all discoverers of small planets.

STONEWALL JACKSON.—II.

Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War. By Lieut.-Col. T. F. R. Henderson, Professor of Military Art and History in the Staff College (England), author of 'The Battle of Spicheren' and 'The Campaign of Fredericksburg.' With portraits, maps, and plans. In two vols., 8vo, pp. 550, 641. Longmans, Green & Co. 1898.

The constitutions of Great Britain and America make the Chief Executive the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy, but in both countries it is part of the unwritten law that he shall not take the field in person. Both constitutions treat it as of the essence of national liberty that the military shall be strictly subordinate to the civil power. Legislative control is so jealously made complete that in England the Mutiny Act, which alone keeps the army in existence, runs for but one year, and the army would dissolve but for annual parliamentary renewal. In America the dependence of Congress upon biennial elections and the limitation of appropriations work, practically, the same result. Both systems make all military organizations, afloat and ashore, depend, in minute particulars even, upon law, which is but another phrase for "civilian control." Both constitutions leave it wholly discretionary with the Chief Executive, as advised by the cabinet, how far he shall go in directing the use of armies under the law, and his commandership-in-chief is not nominal, but an important fact.

Such systems are not accidents, nor the inconsiderate phrasing of the fundamental law. They mean that the liberty-loving people of both nations hold it to be a fundamental truth that the civil control of military affairs is far preferable to the military control of civil affairs, which would be the necessary alternative. They have been educated to that creed by centuries of study in the proverbially costly school of experience. Nothing more startling in the history of the civil war came to light than McClellan's revelation, in his 'Own Story,' of the suggestions that he should make himself dictator, and the assurances that he could do so, both before he took the field with the Army of the Potomac and when he was removed from its command.

Colonel Henderson would, no doubt, declare his adherence to the doctrines of British and American law which we have stated, but they cannot stand with his unlimited demand for military control over the operations of armies and the military resources of the country. Careful writers on strategy state very plainly the principle that armies are used only to execute the political purposes of governments, and that political

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reasons and policy must have controlling weight throughout. If military reasons clash with wise statesmanship, military reasons must yield. Whether statesmanship be "wise or otherwise" is matter for legitimate debate, as is also the question whether military conduct be good or bad; but disagreement with the executive as to his statesmanship does not prove that the general ought to usurp his province and his powers. Clausewitz, the Prussian military authority, puts it, that "policy embraces the employment of war for the good of the state," and our author himself repeats a common form of the same maxim in saying that the army is the servant of diplomacy. Where, then, is the trouble? Simply in this, that, in practice, Col. Henderson habitually denounces interferences by the Government as violations of the *rights* of military officers, when the matter is one in which governmental policy may properly control.

The incident which was made the occasion of the discussion was the threatened resignation of Jackson because of the recall, by the Secretary of War, of Loring's troops from the position Jackson had placed them in. It was in the winter of 1861-2. The troops had been marched in terrible weather in a condition of destitution, hunger, and exposure, which, as the author describes it, was nearly destructive, and for an object of very debatable value. Jackson's weakness for mystery had made him withhold the information which would have enabled the subordinate officers to prepare their men for the hardships, and he seems to have been himself responsible for the failure of transportation and of supplies. The suffering men were nearly in a state of mutiny. Their officers protested in writing at their treatment. Loring, who was a veteran of the regular army, expressed himself indignantly, and Jackson preferred charges against him and demanded that he be court-martialled. Jackson was as yet but little known, and some, even of his staff officers, doubted if he were of sound mind. Loring had been serving in the army while Jackson had been teaching at Lexington, was regarded as an officer of tried ability, and was a man of large influence. The Richmond Government found members of Congress and important public men greatly stirred up about the matter, and thought it wise to interfere promptly, separate Loring's troops from Jackson's, and quash the court-martial proceedings. Considering the condition of affairs in the Confederacy, they seem to have been wise in smothering the scandal by most direct action, not standing upon technicalities of formal inquiries and correspondence in usual routine. But we are not concerned in deciding who was right in the controversy; the matter was plainly one in which motives of general public policy might properly have weight, and which the President and Secretary of War had jurisdiction of. It looks like narrow partisanship to make out of it a grievous abuse of Jackson. He evidently saw that he had made a mistake before he had gone far with it, and allowed his friends to suppress his resignation. He soon learned that there is room for policy as well as rigid military rule in such a war. A few months later he undertook to change the form of the cavalry organization which the Government had authorized the noted officer, Ashby, to raise. Ashby resisted and threatened to resign. Jackson found it politic not to press the issue, just as Mr. Davis had deemed it prudent to allow the organization of Ashby's Legion, Hampton's Legion, Wise's Legion, and others. Davis knew quite as well as Jackson the objections to irregularity of organization, but looked deeper, and found it politic to use a leader's zeal and influence, even at the sacrifice of his own objections. Colonel Henderson uses the incident for another thrust at the Secretary of War, saying that he was induced to do the foolish thing because he was "dazzled by Ashby's exploits." The retort that Jackson yielded to Ashby's defiance because he was also dazzled, would be quite as just. Both were politic, in different lines.

The author follows up his contemptuous characterization of the civil authorities in several specifications in a note at the end of the seventh chapter.

He charges that in the laws of organization the advice of the generals was disregarded. As an historical fact, Scott, McClellan, and others were consulted at every step in the North, and were practically the authors of the scheme established by law.

He charges that the "Northern wiseacres" considered cavalry troops "an encumbrance," and that McClellan was always in difficulties for the want of them. The strongest opposition to a large cavalry force was from the ablest generals, who pointed out the impossibility of adequate training for men and horses in a brief period of time. As for McClellan's inferiority in this arm, he reported on July 10 at Harrison's Landing 4,720 present for duty. Lee reported on July 20 4,041. On October 20, when beginning a new campaign, McClellan reported 6,724; Lee reporting at the same date 6,556.

He charges that the same wiseacres regarded a staff as "a mere ornamental appendage." There is no evidence of it. When a cadet just from the Military Academy could hope in two or three years to command a division of cavalry, like Custer, he could not be kept in the staff. Hancock and Sheridan did not remain Captain-Quartermasters, because the way to become corps and army commanders was through the line. Buell did not remain a Major and Adjutant-General, because he could be and soon was a Major-General. Meade did not remain in the Engineers, because the command of the Army of the Potomac was waiting for him. The same influence worked in the Confederate army, and when Lee, Johnston, and Jackson, Grant, Sherman, and Sheridan were all found of their own accord filling their staff with volunteers, it ought to be clear that some cause besides the whim of the "wiseacres" was operating.

He lays it at Lincoln's door that at first the troops were raised for three months only. The statute fixing that limit to a call for the militia was enacted before Lincoln was born. As soon as he could get Congress together, he asked for and obtained authority to enroll volunteers for three years or the war.

He finally, and with much more justice, criticises the practice of raising new regiments of volunteers instead of sending the recruits to fill the depleted old battalions. Mr. Lincoln would have been the first to admit that it was bad military policy. But could the troops be raised otherwise? A Napoleon or a Wellington would not have dared resort to the conscription in 1861, in the United States, where it was looked upon as the distinctive badge of military despotism. When it afterwards was tolerated, the popular feeling was shown by the fact that it was regarded as the worst of disgraces for a county to fail to keep its quota full by volunteering. "Come in out of the draft" was the humorous byword of the time; and great sums of money were raised by private subscription everywhere, for bounties, to save the townships from shame. We wish the other course had been tried, but should feel that we were flippant if we assumed that Mr. Lincoln's unmatched instinct for practical politics did not wrestle painfully with the perplexing problem. He had more than a score of States to deal with, and the Governors and public men of each had to be conciliated, the popular sentiment in each had to be watched as the sailor watches his barometer, or the ship of state would have foundered. It looks easier in '98 than it did in '62, but it would not argue wisdom if we rushed in where Lincoln trod so cautiously.

Col. Henderson assumes that both Davis and Lincoln were fond of exercising their power by trying to be generals, and by delaying to use professional military advice in strictly military matters. In a cavalier tone he says that, "in a moment of unwonted wisdom, the Confederate President had charged Gen. Lee with the control of all military operations in Virginia," in 1862 (i. 343). In like manner he tells us that not till 1864 did Lincoln "abdicate his military functions" in favor of a general-in-chief, when he appointed Grant (*id.*, p. 255). We do not so read the history in either case. Davis put Lee in control of all military operations in Virginia immediately upon Virginia's joining the Confederacy, and the first Confederate troops that crossed the boundary of the State reported to Lee. The order was not changed till, at Lee's own request, he was sent to a department of the coasts till the question of rank between him and Johnston should be settled by the Senate. At Davis's personal solicitation, Lee returned to Richmond in March, 1862, and was put in control of all military operations in the Confederacy, as chief-of-staff to the President, in substance, and evidently to avoid, in form, the same question of rank. When Johnston was wounded at Seven Pines, Lee's assignment to command the Army of Northern Virginia was with the expressed intimation that he would soon resume his wider duties. When he found that he was sufficiently burdened with his own army, Davis called Bragg to the general direction, and kept him there till the Confederate Congress made Lee general-in-chief in form. Instead, therefore, of its being a lucid interval in Davis, it was his steady purpose from first to last.

In Lincoln's case the historical continuity is, if possible, still more complete. Scott was in due form general-in-chief in command when Lincoln was inaugurated, and continued so until he was succeeded by McClellan in the same office. McClellan was succeeded by Halleck, and Halleck by Grant at short intervals. They were all announced as assigned to command all the armies of the United States. In Lincoln's most earnest advice to his generals, he was careful to add, "This is in no sense an order"; and without following the same formula, Davis was equally careful as to substance. But both still were, as they ought to be, the constitutional and real commanders-in-chief.

The strategy of both Presidents and their War Secretaries is the cause of contemptuous merriment in our author whenever he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

refers to it; but not seldom, it is sounder than that of the general in question.

Mr. Lincoln's order that the national armies should open the campaign of 1862 on Washington's birthday, while it was yet winter, is likened to the order to make on the Czar's name-day "the third and most disastrous assault on Plevna" (i., 285). His comment, in part, is "that McClellan's objections were well founded, it is impossible to deny"; although he grants that the General ought to have done some things on a small scale to assuage the impatience of the people and retain the confidence of the Administration. But the author had already noted the fact, that in the new country of the West, a wilder region, with fewer roads and deeper mud, things were already "going badly for the new Republic. The Union troops had overrun Kentucky, Missouri, and the greater part of Tennessee. A Confederate army had been defeated, Confederate forts captured, and the amphibious power of the North had already been effectively exerted" (*id.*, 261).

The order holding McDowell's corps back from joining McClellan is sharply condemned. Several considerations bear on this. McClellan had deliberately chosen the exterior line of operations by the Peninsula, against Lincoln's judgment in favor of the interior line, which would cover Washington as he advanced, and would make the army of the enemy the first objective (pp. 359-60). Here the President's strategy was better than the General's. In acceding to McClellan's urgency, Lincoln made it a condition that an entirely *specified* adequate force should be left to defend the capital. This was not done, as was reported by a board of "six generals of the regular army" (p. 306) to whom the President submitted the inquiry. He therefore stopped McDowell's corps at Fredericksburg. Our author says of this that "it was worse than folly to interfere with the General's plans when he was on the eve of executing them" (p. 307). The only interference was to call him back to the plan distinctly agreed upon before he started, and from which he could not, in good faith, depart. The event showed that it would have been worse than folly to do otherwise; for Lincoln was sagacious in foreseeing that McClellan would not "march rapidly on Richmond and seize his adversary by the throat," which the author well says was the "best way of defending Washington" (p. 308). Moreover, McClellan still had an army big enough for victory had he been able to use it. Col. Henderson often points out how the character of McClellan modified all the problems of strategy, and justified Lee in what would otherwise be condemned (ii., p. 13). To Mr. Lincoln, at the close of 1861, it was antecedently probable that a fraction of the enemy's forces could occupy McClellan and make him think he was outnumbered, while another part should march on the capital. He was exactly right, and the author asserts that Lee did exactly that thing, and in doing it proved himself "the clearest-sighted soldier in America" (i., 361). Yet Col. Henderson amuses himself with the workings of "the civilian mind" in Mr. Lincoln, in foreseeing it and trying to provide for it.

The arrangement of the forces in the Shenandoah and in western Virginia was made when McClellan was in command of them as general-in-chief; yet their dissemination is attributed to the "unaided wisdom" of Lincoln and Stanton, who had "so ingeniously isolated" them (*id.*, 360-61). It is fairly conceded that "when Jackson pressed forward to the Potomac, it became possible to intercept him, and the President did all he could to assist his generals [McDowell, Frémont, and Banks]. He kept them constantly informed of the movements of the enemy and of each other. He left them a free hand, and, with an opponent less able, his instructions would have probably brought about complete success" (*id.*, 440). Whoever will candidly read Lincoln's calm, clear, patient, courageous, and stimulating dispatches of that month, will see that, viewed purely as military conceptions and judged as military conduct, they put him above any professional military subordinate he had in the field in Virginia. Whether he got it from "the pages of Jomini and Clausewitz" in that military library over which Colonel Henderson makes merry (p. 500), we will not undertake to decide. It would be rash to say how soon his penetrating sight would reach the heart of any book and turn its wisdom into homely but most telling practical form; but we should not be surprised if some future professor in the Staff College should write a book to prove from the Official Records that Lincoln's military library was no mere ornament of the White House. We commend the thesis to aspiring young officers.

In the matter of the removal of McClellan, the proof culminates that Mr. Lincoln's military ideas were sound and his strategy sagacious. Col. Henderson's treatment of it is simply astonishing. Antietam was fought on the 17th of September, and Lee retreated across the Potomac, with a good deal of disorder. Mr. Lincoln urged that the retreating enemy should be promptly and persistently followed, and he was right. He called McClellan's attention to the fact that the best season of the whole year for campaigning was rapidly passing, and that the question of time "cannot and must not be ignored." McClellan wanted to stop and build a railroad to Winchester; Lincoln replied that this meant wasting the autumn and deferring operations to another year. Lincoln further pointed out that Lee's wagon transportation was over roads twice as long as ours, and that he probably had not half as many wagons. McClellan said his plan was to move up the Shenandoah valley. Lincoln pointed out to him that this was to operate by external lines, while internal lines were now ready for him and more available, and covered Washington in his advance, which his would not, were shorter instead of longer, and would enable the Government to reinforce him as he went forward. When McClellan finally moved he adopted Lincoln's line.

Lincoln went further, and showed that by the interior line McClellan could operate directly upon Lee's communications; that he was actually nearer Lee's base (Richmond) than Lee himself, and that it would be his own fault if he did not bring his adversary to battle in a position most of all sought for by competent strategists. Moltke himself could not have dealt out sounder doctrine. Lincoln still again made a strictly accurate analysis of the topography of the theatre of operations, of the location and distance of the gaps in the Blue Ridge, of the connection of roads, and showed that if McClellan could march as fast as his enemy, it was mathematically impossible for Lee to get back across the mountains without a battle with a superior army planted upon his communications. But Lincoln had no weak over-estimate of the value of Richmond, though our author insinuates it. He distinctly said, "If he makes a stand at Winchester, moving neither north nor south, I would fight him there, on the idea that if we cannot beat him when he bears the wastage of coming to us, we never can when we bear the wastage of going to him." Right again; the Staff College could not teach it better.

There was, however, still another contingency: Lee might again invade the North, said McClellan. Lincoln's answer is strictly *secundum artem:* "If he does so in full force, he gives up his communications to you absolutely, and you have nothing to do but to follow and ruin him. If he does so with less than full force, fall upon and beat what is left behind all the easier" (O. R., xix., pt. 1, p. 14). Our author answers that "Lee altogether failed to respond to Mr. Lincoln's strategical pronouncements," and, "instead of fearing for his own communications, he had placed Jackson in a position to interfere very seriously with those of the enemy" (ii., 363). This statement, if quite true, would admit that Lincoln's game was a good one and that Lee thought he could play it better than McClellan. But let us see what Lee thought of his communications. In writing to Jackson authorizing manœuvres and feints, he closed with the gist of his instructions: "You must always keep in view the probability of an attack upon Richmond from either north or south, when a concentration of force will become necessary" (*id.*, p. 367). So Lee himself is again the witness that Lincoln divined him rightly.

An impartial critic must admit that the strategical plan of the President was good; the real question was whether McClellan could execute it. Colonel Hay tells us from personal knowledge that Mr. Lincoln made up his mind that if McClellan "should permit Lee to cross the Blue Ridge and place himself between Richmond and the Army of the Potomac, he would remove him from command" (Nicolay and Hay's Lincoln, vi., 188). He had also been influenced by proof that those in closest relations to the General believed that the inaction was purposed, and that "the game" was to "tire out the rebels and ourselves," then let the sections "come together fraternally and slavery be saved" (*id.*, p. 187). Southern sympathizers with that view could well make strained apologies for McClellan. We do not accept it, but believe he was constitutionally incapable of vigorous generalship in the field. The intelligent comprehension of a military problem, and a just criticism of it, are *toto cœlo* different from the practical capacity to command a great army in the field. Statesmen *must* criticise. They cannot escape it if they would. They must judge of ability and of success, and must remove a general when he does not succeed. Colonel Henderson's characterization of the removal of McClellan as a "deplorable weakness" on the part of Lincoln is, as usual, answered from his own pages, when he adopts Jackson's dictum that "the service cannot afford to keep a man who does not succeed," adding: "His motto was, Get rid of the unsuccessful man at once, and trust to Providence for finding a better" (ii., 421). The author's theory that Lincoln, in 1864, told Grant to "take the responsibility and act," because he had learned his own ignorance, does not fit the facts so well as that he now knew he had in command a man whose courage, energy, and zeal matched his own, and who could be wholly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trusted "to fight it out on that line." It proved that he was no rash meddler, but was only too glad to step back into the civil duties as soon as he might. His intercourse with his generals from the very first showed his desire to trust them, and to have them succeed in their own way, if they would only act with persistent energy.

The rôle of the encomiast tempts a writer to extravagance; and, in his zeal to show Jackson always at the height of ideal generalship, the author cannot escape the temptation to belittle even General Lee. The trend of the book is to put the subordinate above his commander, as above all others on either side who succeeded in leading independent armies in the field. As he never had such a command, it seems to us that the debate is futile. The actual test of such independent responsibility is the only thing that can prove the capacity to bear it. The current of military history is choked with the dead reputations of brilliant subordinates who failed in chief command; and, in Jackson's case, as in others, it is wiser to be content with the striking things he did, and to restrain the eulogist's desire to give him rank according to the greater things he might have done if the opportunity had been accorded him.

A NATURALIST IN THE PHILIPPINES.

The Philippine Islands and their People. By Dean C. Worcester. Macmillan. 1898.

We take this to be the most comprehensive book on the Philippine Islands which has appeared since the work of John Foreman, who has long been an acknowledged authority on that archipelago. It is a rather bulky volume of some five hundred pages, of clear type, printed on glazed paper for the sake of the numerous illustrations. Prof. Worcester went first to the Philippines with Dr. J. B. Steere in 1887-88, actuated, he says, by "an interest in the study of birds as well as by a desire to aid in the exploration of a little-known country." This expedition was unofficial, and another was made to the islands in 1890, this time with the permission of the Spanish authorities. Prof. Worcester visited and worked in all of the most important islands of the archipelago, and his book consists both of a study of existing conditions, and of a very readable narrative of his life and adventures among the peculiar people with whom he came in contact. He seems never to have remained long in one place, and his twenty chapters keep the reader skipping about among the islands, across tempestuous straits, into poverty-stricken villages, up tortuous streams, through swamps and into forests, at one moment mentally soaked to the skin, and at the next parched from the heat of a broiling sun.

In speaking of the much-discussed climate of the Philippines, Prof. Worcester reports with regard to Manila that the mean annual temperature is 80 degrees, and says that, when one remembers that the air is heavily charged with moisture during much of the time, this figure leaves much to be desired. Summing up the facts on climate in general, he states that "if one is permanently situated in a good locality, where he can procure suitable food and good drinking-water, if he is scrupulously careful as to his diet, avoids excesses of all kinds, keeps out of the sun in the middle of the day, and refrains from severe and long-continued physical exertion, he is likely to remain well, always supposing that he is fortunate enough to escape malarial infection." "But with the explorer, the engineer, the man who would fell timber, cultivate new ground, or in some other way develop the latent resources of the country," our author adds, "it is a very different story," and any one really exposed to the climate under such circumstances will find it severe. In conclusion, he remarks that "it is unfortunately true that the climate is especially severe in its effect on white women and children, and . . . . that we have here a serious though not necessarily insurmountable obstacle to the development of the great resources of this remarkable country."

After giving a brief résumé of the history of the Philippine Islands, a chapter on the arrival of the party in Manila and first impressions of the capital, and another on a general description of the archipelago, its resources, volcanoes, rivers, forests, soil, etc., Prof. Worcester takes up his first and second visits to the island of Palawan, which formerly belonged to the Sultan of Borneo. This island is some 300 miles long by 20 in average width, and "the greater part of its surface is covered with magnificent timber . . . among which may be mentioned ebony, logwood, and ipil." He describes the peculiarities of a weird native tribe inhabiting the central part of Palawan, called the Tagbanuas, who are primitive enough mentally to account for the tide "by saying that in a far-distant sea there lived a gigantic crab; when he went into his hole, the water was forced out and the tide rose; when he came out, the water rushed in and the tide fell." "Child marriage in Palawan is extremely common," says Prof. Worcester. "Women are in demand, and it is said that children are sometimes betrothed before birth, with the rather necessary proviso of their turning out to be of the proper sex."

From Palawan the author went to Mindanao (an island nearly as large as Luzon), about whose interior next to nothing has been known until within a short time, and whose confines are filled with wild Malayan tribes who have never recognized the rule of any one, of Spain the least. As Prof. Worcester says: "Although the island is nominally divided into provinces, Spanish control is, as a matter of fact, effective only in narrow and more or less isolated strips along the sea, and near a few of the rivers which afford the only means of communication with the interior." He goes on to describe the mode of government in the few Spanish towns in Mindanao and the character of the civilized natives, and then gives an account of the famous race of Moros whose uncivilized members have so long held the Spaniards at bay.

From Mindanao Prof. Worcester went to Sulu, where Gen. Arolas brought order out of chaos during his governorship, and was so strict with the unruly natives that he is even reported as having published an order "forbidding the trees to shed their leaves on his streets." In Panay the author stopped at Iloilo, the second city of the Philippines, and describes it as being "built on low, flat ground, much of which is filled swamp land. The unpaved streets are always dusty or muddy. . . . The church is ugly, and the public square, once handsomely laid out, was serving as a goat pasture. There are no places of amusement. One sees a few shops and some pleasant residences, but the native quarter seems to be rather mixed up with the rest of the city."

In Negros, Prof. Worcester was brought face to face with the labor problem in the Philippines, and he remarks that it is a

"serious one for all who have to employ men in large numbers. . . . In some islands laborers cannot be had at all unless they are imported, and in any event it is usually necessary to make them considerable advances on salary account before they will do anything. . . . In many parts of the Philippines nature has done so much for the people that they have little trouble in obtaining food, clothing, and shelter. What more do they require? Why should one work and accumulate money only to be robbed of it? Their logic is unanswerable under present conditions."

In Cebu the author found that corn grows better than in any other part of the Philippines. The island has almost been denuded of trees, the soil is shallow, and the climate on the whole exceptionally healthful. From Cebu, Prof. Worcester went to Samar, then to Masbate, and then to Mindoro, which the natives refer to as "white man's grave." Mindoro appears to be noted for the unsavory character of its people, the heaviness of its rainfall, and the deadliness of the miasma in its fever-smitten lowlands. The interior is broken up by mountains, clothed with heavy forests which shelter a race of primitive savages called Mangyans, who go without clothes and without permanent shelter during the dry season. A hand mirror given by the party to one of the men caused him to act like a monkey. He did not recognize his own reflection. In Mindoro Prof. Worcester had some capital hunting, and killed a timarau—an animal something like a small buffalo, rarely gotten at by foreigners.

Luzon was the last island visited, and had not the author been taken down with a fever serious enough to necessitate his departure from the Philippines, he would have investigated the unknown table-lands and unexplored districts of North Luzon. As it is, Prof. Worcester gives some interesting information about this island, with its 42,000 square miles and enormous natural resources, and describes his visit to one of the smallest but fiercest volcanoes in existence—that of Taal, not far south of Manila, which in 1754 completely destroyed four towns and threw cinders into the capital, thirty-four miles away.

In concluding his observations on the government of the Philippines by the Spanish, Prof. Worcester says the home authorities have long been in the habit of employing one set of officials to watch another. Misappropriation of the public funds is found in every quarter, and "from the beginning until now the archipelago has served the horde of hungry Spanish officials as a plundering ground. . . . The whole financial administration is rotten to the core." As to the population of the islands as a whole, the author considers it to be divisible into more than 80 distinct tribes, which may be conveniently grouped as Negritos, Mohammedan Malays, pagan Malays, and civilized Malays. The Negritos stand at the bottom of the scale, and seem to be incapable of civilization. The Mohammedan Malays or Moros are savages who must be held in check with a strong hand, and the nation who would get on peaceably with them must let their religion strictly alone. The pagan Malays are composed of tribes both docile and warlike, and might be ultimately made use of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by converting them into soldiers, as has been done with similar peoples in India. The civilized Malays, to the amount of five millions or more, on whose character depend the questions which concern the future of the Philippines, have many good qualities which offset certain bad traits. The civilized Filipino is hospitable, accommodating, cleanly, and fond of home life. He is a kind father and dutiful son, and usually slow to anger. But with all these amiable qualities, the civilized natives are utterly unfit for self-government. "Their universal lack of education is in itself a difficulty that cannot speedily be overcome," says Prof. Worcester, "and there is much truth in the statement of a priest who said of them that, in many things, they are big children who must be treated like little ones."

Prof. Worcester's wanderings in the Philippines were, as we have intimated, brought to a close by a serious attack of typhoid fever at Manila, and on his recovery he was obliged to give up further exploration and return home. The material in his book is certainly highly interesting. Neither the scientific nor the statistical portions will repel the average reader, who is bound to be entertained by the lively adventures and anecdotes related in a simple, straightforward style. The book is plentifully sprinkled with some 60 illustrations taken from photographs by Dr. F. S. Bourns, who was one of Prof. Worcester's party, and contains a good map of the archipelago.

The Romance of the House of Savoy, 1003-1519. By Alethea Wiel. Putnams. 1898.

Mrs. Wiel has, we must allow, chosen an excellent subject for the sort of light historical work which many women excel in. The chronicles of no other great house in Europe are more packed with striking or strange incidents than are these of Savoy, and the almost legendary heroes of the early centuries are more than equalled in interest by the strong characters whose features are verifiable in the recent annals of the family. Humbert of the White Hands remains, after all is said, rather a dim, mythical personage beside his very human descendant, Emanuel Philibert; and although the Green Count may be—for those who regard armor and castles and portcullises as the true basis of romance—more "romantic," he is certainly less remarkable than Prince Eugene, not to mention Victor Emanuel. We believe so firmly that no previous age approaches our own in real romance that we are a little suspicious of writers who dive into the past to bring up from its depths only "romantic" pearls—as if they were all, or the best, the past could produce. But, granting the desirability of writing light history of this sort, we may say that Mrs. Wiel seems, in the main, to have done her work well; certainly there can be no question that the early history of the House of Savoy is worth writing, or that it is full of interest. So far as we have observed, she is never far wrong, and never very vividly right—that is, she never makes you feel that her account of persons or events is final and conclusive. Her publishers make a mistake in advertising her work as an addition to our knowledge of the House of Savoy, as if it contained revelations not hitherto published by Piedmontese historians; whereas, its value is that it presents, in popular, rather gossipy style, well-known matter for the entertainment of those readers who turn away from formal history. And is it quite honest to state that the illustrations are "reproduced chiefly from contemporary sources," when there is not a genuine portrait of any of the early Savoyard princes? These portraits here reproduced are from an interesting imaginary series made recently by F. L. D. Lange. If Mrs. Wiel had spent ten minutes in the Royal Armory at Turin, she would have seen that the beautiful helmet and ostrich plumes and other trappings in the imaginary portrait of Count Oddo are anachronistic by at least 500 years. What should we say of a person who, having announced portraits "from contemporary sources" of William the Conqueror and the early Plantagenets, should exhibit fancy pictures of those heroes in the full-bottomed wigs and indubitable costumes of Queen Anne's time? Fortunately, not all the illustrations in Mrs. Wiel's book are of this kind; more than half have genuine historical value, and all are beautifully printed. The work, as a whole, may be commended to persons who take their history with as much "romance" as possible, and who trouble themselves little about perfect accuracy or "authorities"; but even readers of a stricter taste will find here a good many passages from old chroniclers who are not easily accessible in English. The volumes are quite worthy of a place on the same shelf with Mrs. Oliphant's 'Makers' of Florence and Venice. There are several slips and inaccuracies, *e. g.*: Louis XVI. was not the son of Louis XV.; Charles Albert did not renew the war on March 24, 1849—that was the day *after* his complete rout at Novara. By an odd mistake, Mrs. Wiel writes of the Chapel of the most holy *Sudario* at Turin, as if Sudario were the name of a saint, instead of being that of the piece of shroud in which Christ was buried, and which has long been Turin's holiest relic.

Human Immortality; Two Supposed Objections to the Doctrine. By William James. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. Pp. 70.

Although Prof. James's Ingersoll Lecture is neither dull nor lengthy nor abstruse, it is not scientific, and contrives in a dainty little volume of seventy pages to make a distinct and substantial contribution to a subject which has for centuries been involved in all the insincerity, obscurity, and prejudice which the passions of men can engender. As might be gathered from the title, Prof. James supposes himself to be addressing an audience willing, if not anxious, to believe in immortality, and so his lecture takes the form of a reply to "two supposed objections to the doctrine"; but he makes his points so simply, clearly, and candidly that he need not fear lest what he says should be treated merely as a sermon convincing only to those already convinced.

His first and foremost argument deals with the materialistic objection that consciousness has been shown to be the accompaniment of cerebral changes and is a function of the brain, so that it is an absurdity not worth discussing to fancy that it can persist after the brain has ceased to function. The "fangs" of this "cerebralistic materialism are drawn" by Prof. James very neatly. He admits all the facts that have been (or can be) proved, but shows that the inference does not follow. Consciousness may be a function of the brain in another way than materialism supposes. That organ need not *produce* consciousness—it may only *transmit* it from some supernal source of truer reality. Brains may be "thin and half-transparent places in the veil" that break and strain and distort the spiritual radiance which they half reveal. This explains the facts to which materialism makes its appeal equally well, and it explains certain other facts much better. It avoids the necessity of having to generate consciousness inexplicably out of matter in "multiplied miracles." It accords with the idealist objections which philosophy makes to materialism. It interprets the psychological notion of a "threshold" above which consciousness rises and below which it sinks when exhausted. And lastly, it dispenses science from the growing embarrassment of rejecting *a priori* the evidence of supernormal phenomena which the psychical researches continue to accumulate.

Such are the arguments on which, with a characteristic allusion to his doctrine of "the will to believe," Prof. James bases his declaration that logically we may believe in immortality henceforth, whether we care to profit by the permission or not. It is to be hoped that among the multitude of those who disagree with him, a champion may speedily arise to take up the challenge, and to set forth with equal or greater courage and candor why he prefers not to believe, how he would prohibit the belief, and what he would substitute for an argument which has so clearly been shown to be unsound.

In the second place, Prof. James considers an objection which is of an æsthetic rather than of a scientific character, and based on "the incredible and intolerable number of beings which we must believe to be immortal, if immortality be true." Formerly, while the world still appeared "a small and snug affair," the imagination could contemplate without dismay and disgust the eternal bliss of an aristocratic élite, but now we shrink from the overcrowding of a Heaven which must be thrown open to Chinamen, Hottentots, and Australians, nay, to animals and whatever has life, and would rather perish in the privacy of the grave than live in so mixed and unsavory a society. To this difficulty, which has probably been felt by all who have given the matter any serious thought, our author's reply seems less original and convincing than in the first case. It consists merely of an appeal to the wider-hearted instinct of democracy, to the belief that to God all life is precious, to the fact that we cannot presume to decide against alien claims whose grounds we are not able to appreciate. That seems the old reply of religious sentiment to the apprehensions of human humility as well as to the exuberance of human conceit, but it scarcely sets at rest the doubt as to whether, in the eyes of God, all worth is equally great or equally small. On the other hand, it may be pointed out that an alternative method of meeting the difficulty has commended itself from the very beginnings of human reflection on the mystery of life. It has always been believed that the vile and contemptible forms in which the spiritual veiled its glory were neither true nor final, and that the reward of strenuous aspiration might reveal itself in a proportionate and gradual rise in the scale of being. And, in our time at least, the faith in a spiritual evolution can find strong support in the fact of a physical evolution.

The great interest of Prof. James's argu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment will be readily apparent from the foregoing sketch, and it may safely be predicted that if the Ingersoll Lectures maintain this level, they will go far to realize the purpose of their founder.

History of American Politics. By Alexander Johnston. Fourth edition, revised and enlarged by William M. Sloane. Henry Holt & Co. 1898.

A new "down to date" edition of this valuable little manual should have been marked by some alterations in the body of the work, as well as additions at the end. It has a few mistakes due merely to oversight. For instance, the reënactment of the Sub-Treasury system, after its repeal by the Whigs, is not recorded. Again, a footnote on page 213 states that only the Fortieth Congress met immediately after the adjournment of its predecessor, in accordance with the law passed by the Thirty-ninth. This is, of course, neutralized in the text by the accounts of the extra sessions held under this law in 1869 and 1871, but the error of the note should be corrected. Also, two different dates are given in different places for the admission of West Virginia to the Union. The date in the body of the book, page 200, is wrong. In a few cases of a somewhat different nature the words of the book are certainly liable to unfortunate interpretation, if not absolutely wrong. The opening statement of the Introduction, that "the Government of the United States, in its original form (in 1777), was an extreme Democracy," is too inexact to be of value. The class of students who use this book need careful definition of such terms as "Democracy," and if it is left to the teacher to supply those definitions, the terms should not be so loosely used in the book as to counteract his work. It is certainly misleading to charge the defeat of a proposition to arm American vessels, in 1798, to "the Republican disposition to tolerate almost any treatment from France," when the Federalists were in the majority in both houses of Congress. When, under Van Buren, the Secretary of the Treasury was directed to receive the notes of specie-paying banks in payment for public lands, the "Specie Circular" was not "annulled," as the book puts it, but modified. In a footnote on page 137 the words "at the next session" should read "in the next Congress" to be correct. On page 151, in treating of the Mexican war, we find the words, "it was certain that any newly acquired territory would swarm with slaveholders." In view of subsequent history, *certain* is not the word. Very few slaves were ever taken into any part of the Mexican acquisitions. The first page of the chapter on Lincoln's first administration describes the condition of affairs at the close of the Buchanan régime in a way that few would have questioned twenty years ago, but historical research has advanced since then. The page should be rewritten in the light of the evidence adduced by James Ford Rhodes and others, during the past decade or two. Buchanan has enough to answer for, without exaggeration. Again, the corruption in the War Department during the first year of the war should not pass entirely unmentioned. Here, too, Rhodes will furnish some valuable suggestions for a revision. And as the book aims to trace the party currents of our history, another edition should not be prepared without a careful study of Van Buren's position as a party leader.

Perhaps the general method of the book is not beyond question. To follow in rigid chronological order the successive administrations and sessions of Congress results in such a chopping up of topics as is scarcely consistent with the desired impression on the mind of the reader. Might it not be better to break loose from these shackles altogether in the body of the work, and give in an appendix a list of important acts of Congress, and other notable events, arranged by administrations and sessions of Congress? We make these suggestions because the book has, and deserves to have, a wide use in our schools and colleges, and hence should be as perfect as it is possible to make it.

Manual of the History of French Literature. By Ferdinand Brunetière of the French Academy. Authorized translation by Ralph Derechef. Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. 1898.

M. Brunetière's work is one of the noteworthy additions to the history of French literature which the latter end of the century has produced. Even had the author not made a reputation as a dogmatic and combative critic before the publication of his Manual, the book itself must have brought him favor and authority. There is nothing to compare with the admirable synthetical review of the literary movement in France which constitutes the major portion of the work. That certain portions of the literature are not treated as fairly as they merit, is true enough—the mediævalists have just ground for complaint on this score; but, taken as a whole, the view of French literature from its origins to the present day is excellent and instructive in the highest degree. The application of the doctrine of evolution to literary productions has not before been made to the same extent or with the same general success. The book is one to be read—that is a matter of course—and frequently consulted whether one agrees with the author or not.

It is, therefore, not surprising that a translation of it should have been called for. Many persons must have wished to derive profit and pleasure from the perusal of a new work by M. Brunetière, of one, especially, in which he had not to touch on burning questions of contemporary politics. M. Brunetière's style does not lend itself readily to translation, but that does not account for the utter unintelligibility of more than one passage of importance in the present version. Nor does it account for the use of expressions which, whatever they may be meant to convey, are not English. At the very outset we encounter "If there be any originality in this Manual it is constituted by this attitude," and "Whether we study these writers in their works, or whether in their works it be they themselves that excite our preference, what interests us in them is what distinguishes them from all other writers, or what in them is irreducible and incommensurable." The distinction between the tenses and moods of the English verb is often ignored by the translator, and the meaning of the original consequently perverted. He (or she, for "Ralph Derechef" is a pseudonym) has evidently sought to revenge fair France on perfidious Albion by maltreating the tongue of the hated "Goddams." The object is surely attained when "what is it diversifies," "still . . . nevertheless," . . . "only . . . merely," "the first edition of them [Commyne's Mémoires] appeared in 1524 . . . and as to the last portion in 1528," "a language is not merely an algebra," "by 'art' it is to be understood," "it is scarcely possible to distinguish between what of them should be attributed to d'Urfé, and what of them is the work of Baro," "there is something specific or unique in its class about the pleasure derived from literature as about that derived from music," "Rousseau's two first Discours," "he made the idea his own, his very own property, and at his epoch his sole property."

All this is bad enough, but the worst of the work is to be found in the biographical and critical remarks on the chief writers which are at the foot of every page. The punctuation adopted by the translator, in faithful imitation of M. Brunetière's use of the dash and the semi-colon, is fearful and wonderful indeed. How any one can be expected to make out the author's meaning without referring to the French original, passes comprehension. One or two instances of this, on page 355, or on pages 41 and 43, in which Voltaire, Clément Marot, and Marguerite de Valois are criticised, will suffice to illustrate this point. Why, finally, has the proof-reading been done so carelessly? And why, in the selection of portraits, has a place been given to Béranger, whom M. Brunetière expresses the utmost contempt for, when Racine and Bossuet, the latter the Brunetière fetish, are not honored with a photogravure reproduction of their seventeenth-century features?

Radiation: An Elementary Treatise on Electromagnetic Radiation and on Röntgen and Cathode Rays. By H. H. Francis Hyndman. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.; New York: Macmillan Co. 1898. 8vo, pp. 307.

Somewhat more than half this book is devoted to the properties of electromagnetic radiation—that is, of light, of the discharges of Leyden jars and oscillators, and of various other kinds. This part of the book answers its purpose; but we shall say no more of it, because the chief interest of the work lies in its collecting all that is essential in our knowledge of the newly discovered kinds of radiation.

The discussion necessarily begins, just as the history of discovery does, with the so-called *negative* rays of Crookes. These rays can exist only under pretty high exhaustions. The negative rays can pass through glass; but if they are focussed on a part of the tube where thin aluminium, and not glass, is the material of the wall, a faint glow will be perceived outside. In fact, there are there, not negative rays, but another kind of rays, called cathode rays. These rays are susceptible of reflection and refraction; their interference is a disputed question; their polarization has never been effected. They do not affect the eye. Their velocity of propagation is less than that of light, suggesting that they reside in a substance similar to, but distinct from, the luminiferous ether. When the current, instead of being steady, is rapidly intermittent, then, without any piece of aluminium, but with some focussing, X or Röntgen rays are emitted. These rays can be reflected, especially from zinc; but no interference or polarization of them has ever been discovered. Differently produced X-rays differ greatly in their penetrative power.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Becquerel rays are rays having peculiar properties, which are emitted by salts of uranium and of other metals. The metals copper and platinum are readily transparent to them; silver and tin are less so; zinc and lead are opaque. Becquerel rays are readily polarized; which shows that they are only ultra-violet-light rays. And the contrast to the X-rays in this respect ought to throw a light on the nature of the latter. "Le Bon's rays" are rays by which photographs can be taken from which the light is shut off by a sheet of iron. "Discharge rays" are rays emitted by an electric spark. They are, no doubt, merely ultra-violet rays. The light of fire-flies, glow-worms, etc., is known to be peculiar, but there is no reason to suppose it other than ordinary light peculiarly sifted.

We cannot say this book is skilfully written. A certain number of facts are overlooked, and it seems almost a matter of chance as one reads whether anything will get mentioned or not. It has evidently been composed by taking all the memoirs on each branch in chronological order, and making an abstract of each; but unless every single statement of every memoir is included, this procedure will result in omissions. If all statements are included, the abstract must itself be digested with pains and skill to make a thoroughly good book. However, the present work is not very faulty in its omissions.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Alden, Mrs. G. R. Reuben's Hindrances. Boston: Lothrop Co. $1.25.
Ames, Prof. J. S. Prismatic and Diffraction Spectra. The Free Expansion of Gases. [Harper's Scientific Memoirs.] Harpers.
A Very Seasonable Kalendar. 1899. Boston: L. C. Poole & Co. 85c.
Barr, Mrs. Amelia E. Maids, Wives, and Bachelors. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.25.
Birdsall, Anna H. A Conflict of Sex. F. T. Neely.
Björnson, B. Absalom's Hair, and A Painful Memory. Macmillan. $1.25.
Brooke, Stopford A. The Gospel of Joy. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.50.
Bross, E. C. God's Pay-Day. G. W. Dillingham Co. $1.25.
Canton, William. W. V.'s Golden Legend. Dodd, Mead & Co. $1.50.
Carrillo, Capt. Mario. In the Saddle with Gomez. F. T. Neely.
Chamberlin, Rose. Advanced Sight Translation (German). Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 15c.
Conway, Sir Martin. With Ski and Sledge Over Arctic Glaciers. M. F. Mansfield & Co. $2.
Corbet, Sybil, and Katharine. Sybil's Garden of Pleasant Beasts. R. H. Russell. $1.25.
Dale, Annan. Dwellers in Gotham. Eaton & Mains. $1.50.
Deland, Mrs. Margaret. Old Chester Tales. Harpers. $1.50.
Demolins, Edmund. Anglo-Saxon Superiority. R. F. Fenno & Co. $1.
Dixon, Mrs. Archibald. The True History of the Missouri Compromise and its Repeal. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke Co. $4.
Dumas, Alexandre. Twenty Years After. 2 vols. T. Y. Crowell & Co. $2.50.
Dunlop, Dr. J. D. Forest Lily. A Novel. F. T. Neely.
Eliot, Henrietta R. Laura's Holidays. Boston: Lothrop Publishing Co. 50c.
Emery, M. S. How to Enjoy Pictures. Prang Educational Co.
Emory, Allan. Within White Walls. F. T. Neely.
Fawcett, Edgar. New York. A Novel. F. T. Neely.
Filon, Augustin. De Dumas à Rostand. Esquisse du Mouvement Dramatique Contemporain. Paris: Colin & Cie.
Flattery, M. D. Wife or Maid? F. T. Neely.
Fowke, F. R. *The Bayeux Tapestry. London:* Bell; New York: Macmillan. $3.50.
Garcia, Lester M. del. Two Washington Belles. F. T. Neely.
Geikie, James. Earth Sculpture; or, The Origin of Land-Forms. London: Murray; New York: Putnams.
Gerard, Dorothea. The Impediment. Appletons. $1.
Gibson, C. D. Sketches and Cartoons. R. H. Russell. $5.
Golm, Rudolf. The Old Adam and the New Eve. G. H. Richmond & Son.
Hall, F. C. A Country Tragedy. F. T. Neely.
Hamm, Margherita A. Manila and the Philippines. F. T. Neely.
Harrison, S. F. The Forest of Bourg-Marie. London: Edward Arnold.
Hedin, Sven. Through Asia. 2 vols. Harpers. $10.
Hemment, Dr. J. C. Cannon and Camera. Appletons. $2.
Holman, Prof. S. W. Matter, Energy, Force, and Work. Macmillan. $2.
Howe, M. A. DeW. American Bookmen. Dodd, Mead & Co. $2.50.
Hume, Fergus. The Rainbow Feather. G. W. Dillingham Co.
Jahrbuch für die Deutsche Frauenwelt. 1899. Stuttgart: Greiner & Pfeiffer; New York: Lemcke & Buechner.
Jameson, C. D. Portland Cement. Its Manufacture and Use. D. Van Nostrand Co. $1.50.
Kaven, E. T. A Duel of Wits. F. T. Neely.
Keenan, H. F. The Conflict with Spain. Philadelphia: P. W. Ziegler & Co.
Kemble, E. W. A Coon Alphabet. R. H. Russell. $1.
Ketcham, Minnie W. Driftwood. Sketches in Poetry and Prose. F. T. Neely.
Kipling, Rudyard. Departmental Ditties, and Other Verses. M. F. Mansfield & Co. $1.25.
Laughton, Prof. J. K. Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Henry Reeve. 2 vols. Longmans, Green & Co. $8.
Le Bon, Gustave. Psychologie du Socialisme. Paris: Félix Alcan.
Lee, Sidney. A Life of William Shakespeare Macmillan. $1.75.
Leibold, C. E. The Woman Proposes. F. T. Neely.
Leudet, Maurice. The Emperor of Germany at Home. Dodd, Mead & Co. $2.50.
Lie, Jonas. Niobe. G. H. Richmond & Son.
Little Bo-Peep. R. H. Russell. 75c.
Lodge, H. C. The Story of the Revolution. 2 vols. Scribners. $6.
Lombard, Louis. The Vicious Virtuoso. F. T. Neely.
Loomis, Chester. New Mother Goose Pictures. R. H. Russell. $1.50.
Mabie, H. W. In the Forest of Arden. Dodd, Mead & Co.
Malet, Lucas. Little Peter. T. Y. Crowell & Co. 50c.
Marcou, P. B. French Review Exercises. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 20c.
Marshall, H. R. Instinct and Reason. Macmillan. $3.50.
May, Sophie. Santa Claus on Snow Shoes, and Other Stories. Boston: De Wolfe, Fiske & Co. $1.25.
Nicholson, William. London Types. R. H. Russell. $1.50.
Paine, A. B. The Arkansaw Bear. R. H. Russell. $1.
Penfield, Edward. Golf Calendar. R. H. Russell.
Perry, W. S. Egypt, the Land of the Temple Builders. Prang Educational Co. $1.50.
Philp, Carolyn H. The Ocean of Dreams, and Other Poems. F. T. Neely.
Rettger, Prof. L. J. Studies in Advanced Physiology. Terre Haute, Ind.: Inland Publishing Co.
Rice, Cale Y. From Dusk to Dusk. Poems. Nashville, Tenn.: Cumberland Presbyterian Co.
Bingham, Rev. J. F. The Twin Sisters of Martigny. Boston: Lee & Shepard. $1.75.
Rives, Hallie E. As the Hart Panteth. G. W. Dillingham Co. $1.25.
Roberts, C. G. D. A Sister to Evangeline. Boston: Lauson, Wolffe & Co. $1.50.
Shuman, Lillian G. From Me to You. Boston: Lee & Shepard. $1.
Smith, Mrs. L. E. In Social Quicksand. F. T. Neely.
Smith, P. H. Little Ethel. F. T. Neely.
Sonnenburg, Ferdinand. Bismarck: His Life and Times. F. T. Neely.
Storke, F. E. Mr. De Lacy's Double. Continental Publishing Co. $1.25.
Stratemeyer, Edward. A Young Volunteer in Cuba. Boston: Lee & Shepard. $1.25.
Sue, Eugene. A Romance of the West Indies. F. T. Neely.
Swett, Sophie. Bilberry Boys and Girls. Boston: Lothrop Co. $1.25.
Syle, Prof. L. D. Essays in Dramatic Criticism. W. R. Jenkins.
Symons, Arthur. The Confessions of St. Augustine. London: Walter Scott; New York: A. Lovell & Co. 40c.
Taylor, C. M. Vacation Days in Hawaii and Japan. Philadelphia: G. W. Jacobs & Co. $2.
Taylor, M. L. A Yankee Volunteer. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. $1.25.
Temple, E. L. Old World Memories. 2 vols. Boston: L. C. Page & Co. $3.
Thayer, Prof. J. B. A Preliminary Treatise on Evidence at the Common Law. Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
The Fairy Book. T. Y. Crowell & Co. 60c.
The Modern Marriage Market. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.
Thorp, E. H. Outlines of Industrial Chemistry. Macmillan. $3.50.
Twenty-two Years' Work at Hampton. Hampton, Va.: Normal School Press.
Van Pelt, Daniel. History of the Greater New York. 2 vols. Arkell Publishing Co.
Waterman, Rev. Lucius. The Post-Apostolic Age. Scribners. $2.
Watson, H. B. M. The Adventurers. A Tale of Treasure Trove. Harpers. $1.50.
Waxweiler, Emile. La Participation aux Bénéfices. Paris: Arthur Rousseau.
Weston, Jessie L. Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. London: David Nutt.
Wyesse, A. W. An Epitome of Human Histology. Longmans, Green & Co. $1.50.
Yechton, Barbara. A Little Turning Aside. Philadelphia: G. W. Jacobs & Co. $1.
Yonge, Charlotte M. John Keble's Parishes. Macmillan. $2.50.
Zogbaum, R. F., and Barnes, James. Ships and Sailors. Illustrated. F. A. Stokes Co. $5.
Zola, Emile. Stories for Ninon. G. H. Richmond & Son.

"*Its volumes stand always at my elbow.*"
—Prof. PAUL H. HANUS of Harvard.

DECEMBER
EDUCATIONAL REVIEW

Edited by Professor NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER.

ARTICLES.—Status of the American Professor, by One of Them; Massachusetts Public-School System, by A. W. Edson; The Latin Author in French Schools, by Stoddard Dewey; The Training of the Teacher, by William H. Payne; Text-books of American History; and What is a University?

DISCUSSION.—The Use of Higher Education, T. D. A. Cockerell, William T. Harris.

REVIEWS. EDITORIAL.

$3 a year (10 Nos., none for July or August), 35c. a copy. Table of contents Vols. I-XV. free.

HENRY HOLT & CO., N.Y.

A Memorial of the late JOHN M. FORBES of Boston being in preparation by his literary executor, the loan of letters that might be helpful is solicited. They may be sent to Mrs. W. H. HUGHES, Milton, Mass.

THE BEST PORTRAITS
OF
Authors Artists
Lawyers Statesmen
Kings and Queens
Musicians
Actors and Actresses
Historical Personages
CATALOGUE ON APPLICATON.
FREDERICK KEPPEL & CO.
20 East 16th St., New York

Please mention the *Nation.*

Easy Experiments of Organic Chemistry: Book by Prof. Appleton.—60 cents: Snow & Farnham, Providence, R. I.

Tennyson

His Homes, His Friends, and His Work. By ELISABETH LUTHER CARY. With 18 illustrations in photogravure and some text illustrations.

Second Impression. Large 8vo, gilt top (in a box), $3.75.

"Full of historic fact and modern comment."—*The Christian Register.*

"The multitudes of admirers of Tennyson in the United States will mark this beautiful volume as very satisfactory. The text is clear, terse, and intelligent, and the matter admirably arranged, while the mechanical work is faultless, with art work especially marked for excellence."—*Chicago Inter Ocean.*

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS,
27 & 29 W. 23d St., New York.

Ready Nov. 25. The Law Book for All Readers. Bouvier's Law Dictionary. Rawle's Revision, 2 vols., $12.00.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED